



$\frac{1}{14678}$

$\frac{75-2}{34}$

LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter.
No.

March 13th 1855.

Case, SCC	Division.....
Shelf, 1641	Section.....
Book,	No.....





Sam^l Barker



A
D E F E N S E
O F T H E
A N S W E R
T O
Mr. *Whiston's* S U S P I C I O N S,
A N D A N
A N S W E R
T O H I S
C h a r g e o f F O R G E R Y
A G A I N S T
St. *ATHANASIUS*.

In a L E T T E R *to* Mr. W H I S T O N.

By *STYANTHIRLBY*, B. A.
Fellow of *Jesus College* in *Cambridge*.

C A M B R I D G E,

Printed at the U N I V E R S I T Y - P R E S S,
for *Cornelius Crownfield* Printer to the U N I V E R S I -
T Y. And are to be Sold by *John Morphew*, near
Stationers-Hall, L O N D O N. 1713.

S I R,

IT will be of little Use to you, or any other Reader, to know the Reasons for which I have so long defer'd the Publication of these Papers, or the Motives which have prevail'd upon me to publish them after so long a Delay. Yet since you have undertaken to account for this Delay, by giving out that I had long ago written an Answer to your Letter, and sent it to the Press, and afterwards recalled it, as if upon a cooler Examination, after the first heat of Writing was over, I had found reason to distrust the Goodness of Athanasius's Cause; I think my self in some measure obliged, in my own Defense, to assure you, that the Story and the Insinuation it carries with it are False and Groundless. It is true indeed, I drew up an Answer to your Letter immediately upon the Receipt of it, but I never sent it to the Press, neither was I ever fully resolved to Print it: Not that I saw any thing Formidable or Unanswerable in your Letter, but because I found my Friends of very different Opinions about it; some assuring me that an Answer to it was generally expected from me, Others on the contrary affirming that the First Part, in which I was more nearly concerned, deserved no Answer; and that the Latter, your new Charge of Forgery, might perhaps be thought to

deserve an Answer from some better Hand. And thus having let slip the most proper time of Publishing these Papers, partly through the Intervention of other Business, but chiefly through the Irresolution which this Disagreement of Opinions amongst my Friends had occasioned in my own mind; I began to think, that they ought either to have been Published sooner, or not at all. For these Reasons they had long lain by me Neglected and Forgotten, till the above mentioned Story of yours, and your loud Triumphs upon all Occasions, in Print and in Conversation, effectually convinced me, that it was now become absolutely necessary for me to Publish them; unless I was willing to have it Universally believed, that I had entirely given up the Cause of Athanasius, as, even in my own Opinion, Desperate and Indefensible. This is what I thought fit to Premise in Opposition to the False Account you have given of this Matter, lest my silence upon an occasion, which may seem so proper for Denying it, should be taken for a Confession and Confirmation of it. And now, Sir, without any farther Preface, I shall address my self to the Examination of your Letter; considering every thing you have said in order as it lies in the Immethodical Method you have prescribed me.

I. **T**HE first thing you Observe in my Answer is, that I all along require full Proof and undoubted Evidence, where you set down your Thoughts only under the Notion of Suspicions. To this I reply, that it is too late for you to think of finding shelter under the modest Title you have given your Thoughts; for though you called them *only Suspicions*, yet you concluded from them as Positively, as you now do from this last *Convictive Discovery*, that *ATHANASIUS* was a *Knave* and an *Ignoramus*¹: so that had I really required positive Proof for a positive Assertion, you would not have had the least cause to Object, that I had mistaken the state of the Question betwixt us, and demanded *Demonstration*, where you pretended to nothing more than Probability. When I am confidently told, that a Man, whose Actions and Sufferings make so noble a Part of Ecclesiastical History, who has been in the Undisputed Possession of so Glorious a Character for above thirteen hundred Years, who was no less than five

¹ Thus Susp. 7. *That this Life of Anthony is not written sincerely by Athanasius is plain &c.* They ought therefore in Consequence to give up Athanasius. Susp. 14 *We hence learn either that Athanasius was forced to Forge, or that he was an Ignoramus.* Susp. 15. *That this is in part deriv'd from his Knavery is Evident &c.* Susp. 16. *He stands here Convicted of Falseness.*

times in Banishment, in *Perils in the City, in Perils in the Wilderness*, and in *Deaths oft*, purely for the sake of his Conscience, was, notwithstanding all this, the greatest Villain in the World; I think it is but Reasonable to expect *Undoubted Evidence* for it. If there be any such thing as a Relative Duty betwixt Men of the present and past Ages, if there be any such thing as a *Communion* and Society betwixt the Church Militant and Triumphant; it is certainly a piece of Justice highly due to the Memory of Those, who have in *their Generations Contended earnestly*, to the Hazard of their Lives, that *the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*, might be delivered down to us also Pure and Undeiled, Not to give up their Characters to every little Surmize. But however, this is not the Case. As Reasonable and Just as it is to expect *Full Proof*, I have been so far from insisting upon it, that I have endeavoured to bring such Proof my self against several of your *Suspicions*. If I have failed in my Endeavours, it was your Business in this Reply to have shewn it, instead of complaining that I have *Required* Of you stronger *Proof* than the Nature of the Thing will admit of; where it is so very plain, that I have pretended at least to bring much stronger *Proof* Against you, than Modern
Suspi-

Suspensions against an Established Character of Antiquity can often admit of, or ever deserve.

TO require such Legal Conviction is still the more Unreasonable, you say, because *the World knows, that the Athanasians have long ago Dropped or Suppressed those opposite Arian Accounts, and many of those Original Records, which were likely to tend so much to their Disadvantage.* That Many Accounts and Original Records have been lost long ago, all the World knows, or easily may know: but it is not altogether so easy to know what was contained in *those Accounts and Records*, which have been lost so long ago. And since so many Millions of Books, and other Monuments of Antiquity, have perished by the Common, and almost Unavoidable, Injuries of Time; since *the Arians* were so notoriously Guilty of Destroying the Writings of the Orthodox; if I had not already observed in your various Works many Instances of that great Power, which our Wills too often exercise over our Understandings; I should have wondered very much how you could possibly work your self up to so full a Persuasion, that neither Time, nor Chance, nor *the Arians*, nor the Worms, but *the Athanasians*, and they only have robbed the World of these Original Records.

II. YOU *Observe* in the next place, that *ATHANASIUS's Accounts* are not early enough for our Satisfaction; as beginning not till about 25 Years after the Council of Nice, and about 14 after those of *Lyre, Jerusalem, and Constantinople*. I must own, I can neither see any Force, nor find any Meaning, in this *Observation*; unless you suppose, that no History is to be relied upon, which is not written and published immediately after the conclusion of the Transactions related in it (which is very seldom done, and often impossible to be done) and that *ATHANASIUS* was under some odd sort of Obligation or other, to write an Annual *Account* of His own Actions, and publish it at the Year's end. Besides, Sir, you may please to remember, what I have already *Observed* to you ¹, that *ATHANASIUS* wrote His *Apology* when there were many People alive, Willing enough, if they had been Able, and such too as had been Able, if any Man had been Able, to prove His *Accounts* False, and His Letters *Forgeries*.

III. IN your Third *Observation* you endeavour to Invalidate the *Authority* of *Basil, Nazianzen, Socrates, and the like Athanasians*; when Quoted as distinct *Authentick Witnesses* for *ATHANASIUS's*

Vindication : particularly, in the Case of Socrates, you say, this cannot but be esteemed by all Impartial Judges a gross Imposition; since himself largely and fully assures us, that he altered those Parts of his History, which he at first had chiefly taken out of *Rufinus*, to accommodate it to the Accounts of *ATHANASIUS*, and that he did not add the Copies of his Records till then. Gross Imposition is a very heavy Charge expressed in Language not the most Courtly; If it should chance to recoil upon your self, you must thank your self for it, and not complain of *Hard Words* or *Reflections*. It is a Compliment which you have made me more than once; but that shall not provoke me to return it, or so much as to call This, in Language something Softer than yours, an Artful Misrepresentation of *Socrates's* Meaning. You will give me leave however to shew, since you have obliged me to do it in my own defense, that you have widely misunderstood and palpably misrepresented his Meaning in this Place, of which the Passage it self is a sufficient Proof without any Comment; Nothing being more plain, than that the chief, if not the only Mistakes, he there says he was led into by *Rufinus*, and had corrected by the help of *ATHANASIUS* (who could not but know the time of His own

Suf-

Sufferings and Banishment better than *Rufinus*) were purely Chronological. " *Rufinus*, says he, has made several Mistakes in "the Notation of Time. For he places "all the Troubles of *ATHANASIUS* af- "ter the Death of the Emperor *Constantine*. "He is also altogether ignorant of His "Banishment into *Gaul*, and many other "things. Him I have formerly followed "in the first and second Books of my Histo- "ry. But having afterwards met with "some of *ATHANASIUS*'s Writings, "in which He complains of His Sufferings "and Banishment; I concluded, that I "ought to believe him who had felt what "he related, and such as had been Eye- "Witnesses of the Facts, rather than those "who went only upon Conjecture.

YOU might have seen too, when you had this Passage of *Socrates* before you, that the second Edition of his History was not Corrected by the Assistance of *ATHANASIUS*'s Writings only, but that he had also found a very valuable Collection of

1 Ρεφίν, Θ — περί τῶν χρόνων ἐπλανήθη· καὶ ὅ κατὰ ἀθανάσιον νομίζει μὲν τὴν πλὴν τῆς βασιλείας κωνσταντίνου γενεῇ, ἀγνοεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν γαλλίᾳ γενόμενὴν αὐτοῦ ἐξορίαν, καὶ ἔπειτα πλείονα ἢ ἡμῶν ἔν τε ἑστέροι καὶ ἐν ἀπολογησάμεναι, τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ δεύτερον τῆς ἱστορίας βιβλίον, ἢ ἐκείνη ἰδοῦναι, συνεγράψαμεν. — ὕστερον μάλιστα συντυχόντες ἀθανάσιον συντάγμασιν, ἐν οἷς καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐδύρει πᾶν, καὶ ὅπως ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλεξολεῖας τῆς ἐν εὐσέβειον ἐξωλεσθῆαι, ἐγνωμὴν δεῖν πιστεύει μᾶλλον τῷ πειπνοῦσι, καὶ τοῖς γενόμεναι τῆς πραγμᾶτος παροῦσιν, ἢ τοῖς κατασκευασμένοις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτο ἐπλανήθη. Socr. H. E. l. 11. c. 1.

Letters,

Letters, written by Men *Eminent in those Times*¹, which were of great Use to him; some of which too he expressly Cites elsewhere². As to your next Clause (*that he did not add the Copies of his Records till then*) The Insinuation has the appearance of more Artifice than I am willing to accuse you of, as not only tending to depretiate *Socrates's Testimony* in general, but also very Conveniently placed to prepare the way for your Grand *Discovery*, by insensibly Prepossessing your Readers with such an Opinion of that Historian, as may afterwards help to remove an Objection against It, and make them the more ready to take it for granted, that *Socrates* was a *famous Transcriber of ATHANASIUS's Records*. But if *he did not add the Copies of his Records till then*, it was not because he had none to add before he saw *ATHANASIUS's Works*; but, as he tells us himself³, because he was first of Opinion, that they would clog the Narration, and make it tedious, though he afterwards altered his Mind and inserted them into the Body of his History. But farther, had *Socrates* expressed himself less clearly, even so as to leave room for Suspicion,

1 Ἐπὶ μὲν καὶ ἐπιστολῶν τῶν πρὸς ἀγαθόρων ἐπιτετυχηκότες, αἷς οἷόν τε τῶν ἀλθέειν ἀνιχνεύσμεν. Socr. l. 11. c. 1.

2 Ὡς δὲ ἡμεῖς ἐκ ἀγαθόρων ἐπιστολῶν εὐρήκαμεν, κ. τ. λ. Id. l. 1. c. 23.

3 Ὑπὲρ τῆς μὴ, πολυσίχως γενομένης τῆς ἱστορίας, ὁ κηρὺς τῆς ἀγνώσκοντος ἀπεργάσθη. Id. l. 11. c. 1.

that he had taken *the Copies of his Records* from *ATHANASIUS*; that Suspicion would immediately vanish upon comparing their *Copies* of the same *Records*, and observing the Variations, which would be found to be at the same time too Inconsiderable both for Number and Weight to affect the Authority of those *Records*, and also too great to be thought consistent with your Notion that the one Transcribed the other. One Instance of this may not perhaps be improper. *ATHANASIUS*, in His Copy of Pope *Julius's* Letter to the *Alexandrians* ¹, besides many other Variations from *Socrates's* Copy ², has omitted several Sentences together, and those infinitely to His own Honour and Advantage; amounting to above a fifth Part of the Epistle. *Socrates* however has taken care to preserve them from some other Copy, and this is not only an Answer to your Exception against *Socrates* as a *Transcriber from Athanasius*, but also an Argument of *ATHANASIUS's* excessive Modesty; in this beyond the Example of the Greatest Men in all Ages, that whereas they generally thought themselves at liberty, when vilified by their Adversaries, not only to justify, but also to commend themselves; He was of Opinion, that the necessity His Virulent Enemies had

(1) *Apol. c. Arian. p. 171, 2.* (2) *L. 11. c. 23.*

brought Him under of Appealing to the Judgment of Better Men could not so far free Him from the ordinary Rules of Decency, as to allow Him so much as to publish the Praises given Him by Others, in opposition to the base Calumnies of His Persecutors. I might add, in Confutation of the above-mentioned Insinuation, that there are still so many Anachronisms, and other little Mistakes in *Socrates's* Account of *ATHANASIUS's* Affairs, that whatever Writings of His that Historian might have met with, His *Apologies*, in which most of His *Records* are to be found, can scarcely be supposed to have been any of them. But to proceed,

SOCRATES being thus set aside; as for *Sozomen*, he *Appears considerably to follow Socrates; and by Consequence ATHANASIUS, whom he followed: and even Theodorit, who has been the most Diligent and Faithful, and produced not a few Copies of Original Records, that were omitted by the rest, does not seldom follow and transcribe from ATHANASIUS also.* So, it seems, They must all be thrown away together, because they agree with *ATHANASIUS*, and with one another; that is to say, Historians must not be believed, because they do not contradict one another. And thus *Philostorgius* being probably himself an Inaccurate
and

and Partial Writer, all the History we have of the Fourth Century, except the little *Eusebius* has vouchsafed us, is to be rejected at once, as of *small Authority and not to be relied upon*, and a new one drawn up, *much after the way* of a *Chronique Scandaleuse*, grounded upon the *Authority of Conjectural Suspicions* by the Accurate and Impartial Mr. WHISTON. So much for the Ecclesiastical Historians; and as for *Basil, Nazianzen, and the like Athanasians*, They are not to be regarded in the least, and that for this Weighty Reason; because they *Either very Probably Might have, Or certainly had, their Accounts from ATHANASIUS*. But you may please to remember, that allowing they *had or might have their Accounts from ATHANASIUS*, yet they lived at a time, when it was the easiest matter in the World for them to inform themselves, whether *His Accounts* were true; nay, when it was almost Impossible for them not to know it, without the trouble of making any Enquiry: I must also put you in mind, that we have only your bare Word for the *Probability* of this, and for the *Certainty* of it, not so much as that Authority. I might add, if this *Observation* of yours appeared to deserve so serious an Answer, that all these Authors at the same time as they agree with *ATHANASIUS*

SIUS enough to establish the truth of His *Accounts*, do also differ from Him often enough, in some little Circumstances, to take away all Suspicion that they Copied after Him.

AND now *If the Athanasians will put on so much Impartiality, as to condescend to this Equitable way of Enquiry about their Leader, you will join Issue with them immediately: but if they persist to refuse this fair Method of Procedure, that is, If they will not reject the Testimony of ATHANASIUS, because it is the Testimony of a Knave in his own Cause, and the Testimony of all Others, who Testify for Him, because they do Testify for Him; You think it is to little purpose to argue with them concerning Him.* This Confession, from such an Adversary, is so clear a Proof of *ATHANASIUS's* Innocence, that it is impossible for His greatest Admirers to say any thing more to His Advantage: and indeed it is almost enough to make a Man suspect, that you have been diverting your self all this while with a very pleasant piece of Prevarication, and have written all these *Suspensions, Observations, Reflections, Propositions, Demonstrations, and Corollarys* with a design to establish *ATHANASIUS's* Reputation, by shewing how little could be said against it upon any tolerable Grounds. For if this
be

be really your Case in Sober Sadness, that you cannot hope to *convict* *ATHANASIUS* unless this *Postulatum* be granted, you might very well have spared your self the trouble of writing the five and twenty Pages which follow this Declaration; for it is all *to little Purpose*, by your own Confession.

IV, V. YOUR two next *Observations* are so exact a Repetition of your former Objections, without taking the least notice of my Answers to them, that I cannot conceive what you could propose to your self by writing them; unless it was to let the World see, that you are firmly resolved to be *Violently Suspicious of ATHANASIUS*, and very Tenacious of your own Opinions, which most People, I believe, were pretty well satisfied of before. However, when you very Gravely tell me that *You must own you can't believe your Suspicions* to be Groundless; you will give me leave to *own* too, that I cannot take that for a Reply: Others may perhaps call it as full an acknowledgment of your Mistakes, as was expected from you. For this steady Adherence in the particular Case of *Arsenius* you vouchsafe to give this Reason, that you *want some better Evidence than ATHANASIUS's*; yet does there no such Evidence appear, but rather the contrary. To this I reply, that we have the concurrent

current *Testimony* of *Rufinus* ¹, *Socrates* ², *Sozomen* ³, *Theodorit* ⁴, *Lucifer Calaritanus* ⁵, *Nazianzen* ⁶, *Epiphanius* ⁷, and *St. Jerom* ⁸, the *Confessions* of *Valens* and *Ursacius* in *St. Hilary* ⁹, and the *Synodical Epistle* of the Council of *Sardica* in *Theodorit* ¹⁰ and *Hilary* ¹¹, where it is expressly said that *Arsenius* was then alive.

HERE, I think, is *Evidence* enough to establish the certainty of any ancient Fact; and, I am sure, five times more than we have or can have for ten thousand Facts, which yet we readily believe. Whether this *Evidence* be better than *Athanasius*'s, is another Question; which you shall decide as you please, and I will stand to your Decision. If you determine that all this *Evidence* is better than *Athanasius*'s, we have, by your own Acknowledgment, some better *Evidence* than His, that *Arsenius* was then alive: If you rather chuse to give it in favour of *Athanasius* than to own this Mistake, and determine that His single *Evidence* is better than all this; it will follow that the concurrent *Testimony* of *Epiphanius*, *Nazianzen*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, *Theodorit*, *Valens*, *Ursacius*, *Hilary*, *Lucifer*, *Rufinus*,

(1) H. E. l. 1. c. 17. (2) L. 1. c. 32. (3) L. 11. c. 25. (4) E. H. l. 1. c. 30. (5) pag. 142, 6. (6) Orac. 21. p. 381. O. 23. p. 417. O. 25. p. 434. (7) Hæc. 68. p. 723, 4, 5. (8) Tom. 4. par. 2. p. 471. adv. Ruf. l. 3. (9) Fragm. col. 411, 12. (10) p. 77 (11) col. 403.

Jerom, Hosius, &c. cannot be compared or opposed to *Athanasius's*; and that let them all say what they please to the contrary, He is to be believed before and against them all.

BUT, to deal Ingenuously, I must in part Retract what I have said of these two *Observations*; for in your fourth long general *Observation* there are a couple of little particular *Observations*, which, I must confess, are so far from being an exact Repetition of your former *Objections*, that they are a direct Contradiction to them. The first of them is thus ushered in with an Air of great Importance, *NAT* when *Basil himself* mentions *Dionysius*, as at last *Favouring the Consubstantiality*, the *Circumstances and Contents of his Passages* seem so fairly to imply, that he had this Account from *ATHANASIUS*, in whom it is, that he cannot, I think, be alledged with any Assurance as a separate Witness from Him in that Matter. However that be, you alledged him with a very Good Assurance, I think, when you pointed to the very Place where he directly contradicts what you cited him to prove. Then, it seems, you was so far from making this or any other Exception against his *Testimony*, that you appealed to him as an *Unquestionable Witness*. But now the Case is a little altered. The Ob-
jection,

jection, which turned upon *Basil's* Differing from *ATHANASIUS*, is now grounded upon the Exactness of their Agreement. In your *Suspensions*, you made it an Argument against *ATHANASIUS*, that His *Account* of this *Matter* was *So Intirely Contrary to Basil*, that no manner of *Dependance* could be had thercon. In answer to This, I proved at large, that *ATHANASIUS* and *Basil* agreed *entirely*. And here, in Defense of your *Suspensions*, and in Reply to that Answer of mine, you say, They agree *So Intirely*, that *Basil* seems to have *had his Account from ATHANASIUS*, in whom It is.

YOU have not yet thought fit to let us know, what these *Circumstances and Contents of his Passages* are, which seem so fairly to imply that he had this Account from *ATHANASIUS*, and to prevent your giving your self that unnecessary Trouble, I must desire you once more to run over *St. Basil's Book Of the Holy Ghost*, where you will find, that he makes several Quotations from the second of those *Apologetical Epistles*; and the Passages he cites not being in *ATHANASIUS*, it is plain he had seen those *Epistles* himself, and that his account of *Dionysius's Doctrine* was from his own Knowledge, and not from any Information given him by

*ATHANASIUS*¹. But to proceed,

MUCH less, you say, *can Eusebius's mention of some of his Letters to his Name-sake, about the Sabellian Heresy, be quoted to confirm the same: since there is not the least hint in him, that they really contained such things as ATHANASIUS cites from them.* Here too your memory seems to have failed you a little. You have forgot, I presume, that one of your Reasons for Questioning the *Genuineness* of these Epistles was their being *wholly omitted by Eusebius*; in Opposition to which Assertion, I largely proved, that they were not omitted by him. Beaten thus out of that hold (instead of Defending, or fairly Retracting, what you then so rashly advanced) you fly for Refuge to this little Exception; as if it could be expected, that *Eusebius* should give us the Contents of those *Letters*, any more than of the others mentioned by him in the same Chapter.

1 Καὶ ὁ ἀλεξανδρεὺς διονύσιος — ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς τὸν ὁμώνυμον ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιστολῇ πρὸς ἐλέγχου καὶ ἀπολογίας ἔτι τὸν λόγον ἀνέπαυσε γράφω ὃ ὑμῖν αὐτὰ ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ῥήματα. Τέτοις, φησὶ, πᾶσιν ἀκολουθεῖτε καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ δὴ καὶ παρὰ τὸ πρὸς ἡμῶν περισυυτέροις τύποις ἐκάνοντα παρελκυστικῶς, ὁμοφάντως τὴν αὐτῶν πρὸς σευχαριστίας, καὶ δὴ ἐν οὗτοι ὑμῖν ἐπιστέλλοντες καταπαύσασθαι τῷ ὃ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, καὶ υἱῷ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι, διὰ καὶ κράτος εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. — ὅς γε καὶ κατὰ μέσον πρὸς τὴν γράφην ἔτι εἰρηκε πρὸς τὰς σαβελλιανὰς. Εἰ τὰ τρεῖς εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις, μεμελεσμένης εἶναι λέγειν, τρεῖς εἶσι καὶ μὴ θείωσιν, ἢ τὴν θείαν τριάδα παννιπλῶς ἀνελίττωσιν. Καὶ πάλιν θησιόταται ὅς, διὰ τοῦτο, μὴ τὴν μονάδα ἐκ τριῶν. Bas. de Sp. Sancto c. 29. p. 358.

HERE also I must *Observe*, that you all along mistake the Nature and Design of my Answers, and argue against them no otherwise, than as if every thing said in Confutation of any one single Objection, was meant to be a compleat Demonstration of the main Point in Debate. Thus, in the Case before us, you make my Proof of *Eusebius's mentioning these Epistles* to be inconclusive, because he does not tell us, *that they contained such things as ATHANASIUS cites from them*: whereas my business there was, not to establish their Authority by any positive Argument, but to refute that particular Argument of yours against them; my Design was, not to conclude that they were certainly Genuine, because *mentioned by Eusebius*; but to shew that you had falsely concluded them to be spurious from *Eusebius's* silence. And that I have there effectually done, even to your own Conviction, as you have thus artfully and covertly thought fit to acknowledge. I could easily bring many more Instances, where you have Confounded your Self and your Readers, by taking no Notice of this plain Distinction, particularly in your *Reflections*, as you call them: but the Examples of it are so very Numerous, and the thing is so Obvious of it self, that I think I may safely leave it,

with this single Precaution, to the Observation of any Reader.

VI. YOU Observe Sixthly, *that the best Way the honest Reader can take for his Satisfaction in all Cases, is the Perusal of the Original Books and Passages themselves, and not of those accounts of them, which modern Party-men afford him from them.* A very just Observation this truly; but, in my Opinion, a very strange way of Replying. After you had affirmed *ATHANASIUS's* youthful Treatises to be *Arian*, After you had engaged all your Judgment in these Matters upon it', After I had challenged you to maintain your Opinion, and assert the Credit of your Judgment; it was a little surprizing, to see you content your self with *desiring* the Courteous Reader to satisfy himself by his own perusal of those Treatises, and not to take any *Athanasian* Representation in that Case. It is true too, the judicious Reader had much better peruse *ATHANASIUS's* Oration and Discourses, and see with his own Eyes whether He reasons weakly or strongly, than take either your Word or mine: But you might have remembered, that whereas there was only your bare Word on one side of the Question; I did not desire that my Word, or even *Photius's*, should be taken.

1 Containing as far as I can Judge, &c. Susp. 5.

To the rash Censure you had passed upon ATHANASIUS's *Manner of Reasoning*, I opposed indeed the contrary Opinion of the best Judges in all Ages; and I singled out *Photius* for an Instance, as an Author, whose Abilities and Impartiality could not, I thought, be disputed by any Man, who had any tolerable Pretensions to either of those Qualifications himself. The latter of them, I find, you are by no means willing to allow him in this Case; fancying to your self, I suppose, some Necessity, that a Man must think a Book well written, because he likes the Subject; and admire *the strength* of an Author's Arguments, because he subscribes to the Orthodoxy of his Conclusions. How far *Photius* in particular was from lying under any such Necessity, and how little reason we have to suspect, that the Affections of *the Party-man* imposed upon the Judgment of the Critick, we may learn from the Justice he does to *Eusebius's* Learning and Diligence at the same time that he calls him an *Arian*¹: And he who can see, acknowledge, and applaud Perfections in an Adversary, cannot well be supposed so blinded with Prejudice, as not to be able to see the most visible Weaknesses in those of his own side; Prejudice

¹ Vide Codd. 13, 27, 40.

naturally working as strong the one way as the other. *Photius* therefore could not be so Prejudiced in Favour of *ATHANASIUS*, but that he might easily have discovered *the Weakness* of His Reasonings, Especially if they were so very Miserable, that *he who has a mind to be an Arian needs but read over ATHANASIUS's Orations against the Arians* (which *Photius* particularly and Highly Commends for Solid Reasoning and Strength of Argument) *to Convince him of the Indefensibility of that Cause* ¹. If the Case be so indeed, you was very much in the right to recommend *the Perusal* of those Orations: But Certainly *he must have a very great mind to be an Arian, who needs no farther Conviction than barely to see, that a Person of Little Learning, and one who argues Generally Very Weakly, does not argue strongly against that Heresy; and can immediately conclude that a Cause is Indefensible, because it is but poorly defended by a Miserable Reasoner.* Neither is it easy to be Conceived, how so *Weak a Reasoner* should be able to destroy the Plain, Simple, Primitive Faith, and advance in its room a Metaphysical Scheme of Absurdities, Contradictions, and Impossibilities; and establish it too so firmly, that it should be the Constant Faith of

¹ *Prim. Christian. Reviv'd*, v. 4. p. 131.

Christians for so many Ages, notwithstanding the Express Promise of our Blessed SAVIOUR to the Contrary: This, I say, is what I cannot well apprehend, and I am apt to think you will find your self as much at a loss how to account for it; unless you have recourse to the Old Calumny, which our English *Socinians* have been beforehand with you in *Reviving*, that *Athanasius* was a Conjuror, and so make this Universal Delusion the Effect of His Magick and Witchcraft.

YOU Proceed in the next place to apply your General *Observation* to the Particular Case of *Arius's Death*, and to beg of the *Impartial Examiner*, that he will read the *Three Epistles of Athanasius to the Bishops of Egypt and Lybia, to Serapion, and to the Monks, before he suffers himself to be put upon by me; the two last-mentioned of which Letters, you say, were first written, whatever the Editors and others suppose*. All I have said, relating to the Order in which these Epistles were written, is as follows; "But farther, to put it beyond all doubt, that this Caution was not meant of the Epistle, or the Relation of Arius's Death, All the World, I suppose, will allow, that if a Man desires to have a False Story he has told Concealed, the proper time of giving that Caution is when he first

“first tells it: And yet *Athanasius* in
 “His Letter to the *Ægyptian Bishops*,
 “where, according to *Mr. Whiston*, He
 “first Discovers the Secret of *Arius’s*
 “Death, puts in no Caution at all for Con-
 “cealment, but ventures it with them to
 “Shew, and Copy, and Spread abroad
 “as far as they pleased ¹. Here, you see,
 I affirm nothing but only draw an Argu-
 ment *ad Hominem* from what you had de-
 clared to be your Opinion in that very
Suspicion, which I was then Examining².
 And now after all, what if *the Editors and*
Others, and, amongst the rest, the Author
 of the *Suspensions*, should be in the right; and
 the Author of *Athanasius Convicted of For-*
gery in the wrong? The Reason you bring
 against *the Editors* and your self, to prove
 that *the Epistle to the Bishops* was written
 after the other two, is, that *the Plainest*
Chronological Character of 36 Years after
the Condemnation of Arius by the Council
of Nice, therein mentioned, implies it.
 The words of *Athanasius*, from which you
 draw this Conclusion, are these. Οὐ γὰρ
 ὀλίγος ἐστὶν ὁ χρόνος· ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν πρὸ πεντήκοντα
 ἔτη πάντα ἐπὶ τοῖς χρισματικοῖς γρόνοισιν· οἱ δὲ πρὸ τετα-

¹ Answer p. 79.

² Yet twenty Years afterwards is He forced to write an Account of it to the *Ægyptian Bishops*, to secure them to His own Orthodoxy: nay a little AFTER is He Again obliged, tho’ with great Reluctancy, to write it more largely to *Serapion, &c.* Susp. 2. p. 104.

κοντα καὶ ἕξ ἐτῶν ἀπεδείχθησαν αἰρετικοί, καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπεβλήθησαν ἐκ κρίσεως πάντος τῆς οἰκουμένης συνόδου'. Hence you infer, that this Epistle was written 36 Years after the Council of Nice, that is, A. 361; which I am the less surprized at, because this very Passage has led Cardinal *Baronius* into the same Mistake, and, as Error is very Fruitful in Propagating its Kind, into another Mistake also about the Rise of the *Melitian Schism*. On the Contrary, I will presume to affirm, that the Condemnation of *Arius* herein mentioned is, and necessarily must be, meant of his first Condemnation by the Synod of *Alexandria*. I think I may take it for Granted, that the Words will admit of this Sense, by dividing the Sentence with a *Comma* after αἰρετικοί, as it ought to be; and that the Sentence ought to be so Divided, and the former Branch of it refer'd to the Synod of *Alexandria*, and the latter only to the Council of *Nice*, is, in my Opinion, Demonstrable by several Undeniable Arguments.

1. IF the whole Passage belongs to the Council of *Nice*, this Epistle must have been written A. 361, which cannot possibly be; for, as the *Benedictins* have al-

1 *Athanas.* Op. Tom. 1. p. 293.

2 *Ann.* 306. num. 44.

ready observed¹, it is plain from the Epistle it self, that it was written before *George of Cappadocia* seized upon the See of *Alexandria*², which happened in the Year 356. This Argument of the *Benedictins* is farther Confirmed by the Agreement betwixt the Time when we suppose the Epistle to be written, and the time when the Council of *Alexandria* was held, which, according to the best Conjectures that can be made at this Distance, was *A. 320*, to which add the 36 Years here mentioned and you have the true date of the Epistle, *A. 356*. This alone is sufficient to shew, that the Epistle was written long before 361, and Consequently that the 36 Years cannot be reckoned from the Council of *Nice*, held *A. 325*. Whence it is plain, that the Sentence must be Divided, and understood as if *Athanasius* had said, “It is not of late that these two Sects have began to disturb the Peace of the Church; for the *Melitians* have been Schismaticks these five and fifty Years, and it is no less than 36 since the *Arians* were first declared Hereticks (i. e. by the Synod of *Alexandria*) which Sentence was afterwards ratified by the General Council of *Nice*.

¹ Monit. ad Epist.

² Διὰ τὴν γοῦν ἐ Γεώργιον ἀπὸ τῆς Καππαδοκίας μετὰ τὴν
 ἔλυσιν τῶν ἀρεσκείων πρὸς ὑμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. §. 7. p. 277.

2. *ATHANASIUS*, where He was professedly Observing what a long time it was since the *Arians* were declared Hereticks, would most certainly begin His Computation from their first Condemnation: But that they had been Condemned and declared Hereticks by *Alexander* and the Synod of *Alexandria*, several Years before the Council of *Nice*, is as plain, as that there ever was such a Person as *Arius*.

3. WHEN this Epistle was written, *Leontius*, the *Arian* Bishop of *Antioch*, was alive¹, who dyed in the Year 358, if not earlier, as *Pagi* has clearly proved²; which carries the Date of the Epistle backward at least as far as 358, and shews at the same time, that the *Condemnation of Arius therein mentioned* cannot possibly be his Last Condemnation by the Council of *Nice*; because then that Council must have been held *A. 322*, which, as all the world knows, did not meet till 3 Years after.

4. *ATHANASIUS* wrote this Epistle immediately after His flight from *Alexandria*, before *Georgius's* Arrival, and He continued in that Banishment six Years³; so that if it had been written in the Year 361, He could not have returned till 367; whereas it is Evident that He returned in

¹ Epist. p. 277.

² Critic. in Baron. Tom. 1. p. 487.

³ Vide *Pagi*, Critic. in Baron. Tom. 1. p. 498, 9.

30 *A Defense of the Answer to*
the Beginning of *Julian's* Reign, *A.* 362,
which exactly agrees with the True Date
of the Epistle, *A.* 356, and utterly destroys
yours and *Baronius's*.

5. IF the Dates of these Three Letters could not be discovered, we should yet have all the Assurance in the World, that *the Epistle to the Bishops* was written before that *to the Monks*; because when *Athanasius* wrote His *History of the Arians* (to which the last mentioned Epistle is an Introduction) *Georgius* had made his Entry into *Alexandria* ¹, which he had not done when *the Epistle to the Bishops* was written, as has been already observed.

I HAVE dwelt thus long upon the Proof of this, not without some hopes of satisfying you of your Mistake in this Point, where you are so very Positive, and upon which too you was once in the Right, till you found it Convenient for *Athanasius's* *Conviction* to be in the Wrong; hoping also, that this might lead you into a Way of Thinking, with which I am afraid you are not enough acquainted, I mean, that it might suggest to you the Necessity of being more Cautious and Jealous of your self, than to suffer your Inclinations to turn the Glass for you, and represent Arguments to your View Magnified or Di-

¹ Hist. Arian. p. 374, 375, 389.

minished, according as they make for, or against, what you have a mind to Believe.

BUT I have not yet done with your sixth *Observation*. There, instead of Endeavouring to make good your Thirteenth *Suspension*, you expect the Honest Reader should himself compare the Citations Athanasius makes from Dionysius's Letters, with the Doctrine of Dionysius, as delivered from a Compleat Knowledge of his Works by Basil. In your Thirteenth *Suspension* you say, the pretended Epistle of Dionysius is Intirely Contrary to the Known Doctrine of the same Dionysius, as we are assured from an Unquestionable Witness, Basil Himself. In your Fourth *Observation* you say, Nay when Basil Himself mentions Dionysius as at last favouring the Consubstantiality, the Circumstances and Contents of his Passages seem so fairly to imply, that he had this Account from Athanasius, that he cannot be alledged with any assurance as a separate Witness. This is in the Sixth Page, and now at last, no farther off than in the Ninth Page of the very same Letter, Basil Himself and you have altered your minds again. Is it not strange, to see such a Monstrous Heap of Contradictions in an Argument against the Authority of Dionysius's Epistles, drawn from their pretended Contradiction to his Former Doctrine? Basil is first an Unquestionable

onable Witness against *Athanasius*, Then he changes sides, and is become so Clear a *Witness* for Him, as to be excepted against purely for the Exactness of his Agreement with Him; And here of a sudden he tacks about again, comes over once more to your Interest, and Deferts his *Leader Athanasius*. In the Thirteenth *Suspicion*, *Basil's Account* is Contrary to *Athanasius's*; In the Fourth *Observation*, it was taken from *Athanasius*; In the Sixth, it was *Delivered from a Compleat Knowledge of Dionysius's Works*. In the Thirteenth *Suspicion*, *Basil* is appealed to as an *Unquestionable Witness*; In the Fourth *Observation*, the *Honest Reader* is Cautioned not to take any Notice of what he says in that matter; In the Sixth, it is *Authoritatively Expected*, that he should himself read his Account of that Matter, which Account he had from *Athanasius* in whom it is, in order to be Convinced, that *Athanasius's Account* of it is False.

IF you could have gained an Advantage against *Athanasius* infinitely less than this, I am very apt to think you would have Improved it to *Conviction* upon *Conviction* of His *Knavery* and *Insincerity*; Yet I shall not so much as Endeavour to ground a *Suspicion* upon it, to your Disadvantage in the Point of your Integrity. I had much rather put it upon another Foot, and

Observe

Observe in Excuse for you (and it is, I think, the best your Case will bear) that your Will is as Absolute over your Memory, as over your other Faculties. But to leave this Unpleasant Subject,

AFTER your many Requests to your other *Readers*, whom you Compliment with the Epithets of *Honest, Judicious, and Impartial*; You *Desire* of me, in *Particular, some Certain Parallel so Early to the Famous Passage* concerning the TRINITY lately restored by the *Benedictins*. Your meaning is, I presume, that this *Passage* contains an Explication of that Mystery Clear enough for the Fourth Century, and that you cannot believe it was written in the Third, unless some Undoubtedly Genuine *Passage*, as Clear and Full as this, be produced from some Writer of that Age. To this I answer, 1. that if this Way of Arguing be allowed to be Good, it will be Impossible to Prove, that either the Orthodox Doctrine of the TRINITY, or yours, or any other, was the Doctrine of the First Ages. For if the Clearest and fullest Testimony must be thought Spurious, because there are no other so Clear and Full; most of them must be rejected in their turns, and the *Evidence* on all Sides reduced to such as say the same thing in the very same words, of which sort it is very Unreasonable to
G expect

expect any Great Number. 2. If it was always the *Faith of Christians*, that there is but one GOD, and that the FATHER is GOD, the SON GOD, and the HOLY GHOST GOD; what wonder is it, that *Dionysius* should Express this Notion so Clearly; unless you cannot conceive how a Bishop of *Alexandria* should be a Man of a Clear Head, because *Athanasius* was a *Miserable Weak Reasoner*? 3. Though, as I have just now Suggested to you, this *Passage* is sufficiently defended by those Places in the Writings of *the Fathers*, which Prove the Orthodox Doctrin of the TRINITY to be a Christian Doctrin; yet, for your farther Satisfaction, I will endeavour to let you see, that other Writers, not only of the Third, but also of the Second, Century, have fully and Clearly Expressed this Doctrin, as well as *Dionysius*; and that in Words as Determinate, and often the same, as those which were in more General Use in the Fourth Century, and which you therefore call the Style of that Age.

JUSTIN M. who lived early in the Second Century, and, as *Eusebius* says, *not long after the Apostles* (who was also, as you say, *so Wise a Man, and so Good a Christian, as not to mix his Philosophy with his Christianity in these Matters*) in his

1 Μιστ' ε' πολλο' τ' λ' πιστ' λων. E. H. l. 11. c. 13. p. 40.

2 Primit. Christian. Vol. 4. p. 128.

first *Apology* has these Noted Words. Ὁμολογῶμεν τῷ τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἔχι' ἡ ἀληθεύειν — θεοὶ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε, καὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτῷ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα — πνέσκειν τε τὸ πνευματικὸν σέβόμεθα καὶ πνευματικῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ πρῶτοντες ¹. And in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, towards the End ² there is this Passage, to omit many others. Καὶ λόγον καλῶσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ πατρὸς ὁμιλίας φέρει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἀτμήλον ἢ καὶ ἀχώριστον τῷ πατρὶ τῷ δυνάμει ὑπάρχειν ὅντως τρόπον τὸ τῷ ἡλίῳ φασὶ φῶς ὅτι γῆς εἶναι ἀτμήλον καὶ ἀχώριστον, ὅντως τῷ ἡλίῳ ἐν τῷ ἑρμηνεύει· καὶ ὅταν δύσῃ, συναποφέρεται τὸ φῶς· ἔτι οὗ πατὴρ, ὅταν βέληται, λέγεται, δύναμει αὐτοῦ πνευματικῶν ποιεῖ· καὶ, ὅταν βέληται, πάλιν ἀναστρέφειν εἰς ἑαυτόν. — Ἀλλ' — ὅτι δύναμει αὐτῇ — ἔχ, ὡς τὸ ἡλίῳ φῶς, ὁνόματι μόνον χρῆται, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρῆται ἑτέρῳ πρὸς τὸ ἐν τοῖς πνευματικαῖς ἀφ' ἐκείνων τὸν λόγον ἐξήτασα, εἰπὼν τὸ δυνάμει τῷ γεννηθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δυνάμει καὶ βελῆ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔχ' ἐπὶ ἀπολογία, ὡς ἀπομερίζομένης τῇ πατρὶ ὁμοίας, ὅποια τὰ ἄλλα πάντα μερίζομενα καὶ τεμνόμενα οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐστὶν ἀ καὶ πρὸς τμηθῆναι· καὶ ψυχῶν δειγμάτων χάριν παρελήφειν τὰ ὡς ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἀναπτόμενα πυρὸς ἑτέρα ὁρώμενα, ἡδὲν ἐλαττωμένους ἐκείνους, — ἀλλὰ ταῦτο δυνάμει. If *Justin* had lived after the Council of *Nice*, and designed to Paraphrase upon the Word ὁμοῖος, and defend it against the Cavils of

¹ P. 11, 12. Ed. Grabe.

² P. 358, 9. Ed. Paris.

Hereticks, I believe he would have found it Difficult to have expressed himself more clearly. And accordingly, if *Athanasius* had Quoted this Place, and *the Dialogue* had afterwards been lost, I don't know but we might have had as *Vehement a Suspicion* raised upon it, as upon His Quotations from *Origen* and *Theognostus*.

THIS *Passage* of *Justin* being manifestly levelled against those Hereticks who in the following Century were called *Sabellians*; I shall take Occasion from it to Communicate to you an Argument for the Antiquity of the Orthodox Doctrine concerning the TRINITY, drawn from the Origin and Antiquity of that Heresy. I am not so Prejudiced in its Favour, because it is my own, as to fancy it a *Discovery* of the Last Importance; and yet I think there is so much force in it, as a Collateral Proof, that I am a little surprized not to find that it has ever been used as such by the Learned Advocates of the *Nicene Faith*.

THE *Sabellian* Heresy was invented to reconcile the Belief of the Church, that the FATHER is GOD, the SON GOD, and the HOLY GHOST GOD, with that first Fundamental Article of Faith, that there is but One GOD. This they thought could not be done, but by making the Distinction betwixt the Persons to be
Purely

Purely Nominal¹, and FATHER, SON and HOLY GHOST only Different Names given to GOD in Scripture upon different Occasions, and in three different Respects²; otherwise they thought it Impossible, that the Mystery of the TRINITY could be conceived to be Consistent with the UNITY of the GODHEAD. That it was this Attempt which gave Rise to that Heresy, is sufficiently Plain from the Nature of the Heresy it self, and is also confirmed to Demonstration from the Fragments of their Arguments to be found in Ancient Writers, and other Testimonies of the like

1 Καθ' ἑνὸς καὶ ὁ αὐτοῦ προφύγματος ἔκ προσηώπευε τὰ τρία ὀνόματα ἀσεβῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες. Quarta Arian. Fid. Form. ap. Athan. de Syn. p. 740. Ὄνόμασι μὲν ἀφ' ὧν πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ χρηματίζοντα, οὐσία δὲ καὶ ὑποστάσις ἐν ὄντι. Euseb. c. Marcell. l. i. c. i. p. 5. Πάντα συγχίαν, ἔνι προφύγματι πᾶς πείσας προσηγορίας ὡσιπῆις. Bas. Hom. c. Arian. & Sabell. p. 521. Ἐν προφύγματι πολυώνυμον. Id. Ep. 64. p. 100. Ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς ὀνόμασι. Epiph. H. 62. p. 513. Ἐν τρισὶν ὀνόμασι κεκλημένον. Id. ib. p. 515. Ἐν τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ τρεῖς ἐφαρμόζοντες ὡσηγορίας. Greg. Nyss. T. 2. p. 331. Τοῖς ὀνόμασι ἀφαιροῦντες τὸ ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ. Origen. Comment. in Matth. p. 470. Sola Nominis Trinitas sine subsistentia Personarum. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. xi. c. 10. Trionymam Solitarii Dei Unionem. Sulp. Sev. p. 271. Trinomium adserens Deum. Vigil. Tapf. c. Arium, Sabellium & Photinum. l. iii. p. 188. Edit. Chifflet.

2 Ἐν μὲν τῇ παλαιᾷ, ὡς πατέρα, νοουητέσθαι ἐν δὲ τῇ καινῇ, ὡς υἱόν, ἐνανθρωπήσθαι· ὡς πνεῦμα δὲ ἄγιον, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπιθεῖσθαι. Theod. Haer. Fab. l. ii. c. 9. Πρὸς πᾶς χρείαν τοῦτο ἀκκέτο καλέσμενον. Id. ib. l. iii. c. 3. Κατὰ πᾶς ἐπινοίας ἀφ' ὧν, κατὰ ὑπόστασιν, λέγεσθαι πατέρα καὶ υἱόν. Origen. Comment. in Joan. p. 186. Non distinctione Generis, sed Officii permutatiōne. Vig. Tapf. p. 188.

nature¹. It is also very Easy to prove that this Herefy, which in the Third Century took its last and best known Name from *Sabellius*, was Contemporary with the first Preaching of Christianity. In order to that, if my Present Design would admit of it, I might soon trace it up from *Sabellius* (by *Paul of Samosata*², *Noetus*³, *Beryllus*⁴, *Cleomenes*, *Epigonus*⁵, *Aeschines*⁶, *Praxeas*⁷, *Hermogenes*⁸, *Valentinus*⁹, and Others whose Opinions are mentioned

1 Κέχρηται — πρῶτον μὲν τῶν ῥητῶν — Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς σε, Κύριος εἰς ἡμεῖς, κ. τ. λ. Epiph. H. 62. p. 513. Ὅταν συναντήσωσί ποί αὐτοὶ Φελεσάτων — τὴν πῦσιν αὐτοῖς ὑφηγοῦν) παύτην — ἓνα Θεὸν ἔχοντα, ἢ τοῖς Θεοῖς; Id. ib. p. 514. Τὰς ἐνεκα εἰ πολλὰς Θεοὺς λέγουμεν, ἀλλ' ἓνα Θεόν, — αὐτὸν πατέρα ἔχοντα, αὐτὸν υἱόν. Id. H. 57. quae est Noet. p. 481. Μὴ πολυθεΐαν ἡγήσονται οἱ τὸ σέβας ἀληθινῶς τῇ τελευτῇ προσφίροντες. Id. ib. p. 483. Volunt autem dogma suum constituere & confirmare, quia est in Lege: Non erunt Vobis Dii alii praeter me. — Sic aiunt probare unum esse Deum, & respondent: si Christum confitemur Deum, igitur ipse est Pater, si est Deus. Hippolyt. de Myst. Incarn. c. Haer. Noet. ap. Bib. PP. Max. T. 3. p. 261. Ergo inquis, si Deus dixit & Deus fecit; si alius Deus dixit, & alius fecit; duo Dii praedicantur. Tertull. c. Prax. p. 643. Εὐλαβημένους δύο ἀναγρεῖσθαι Θεοὺς. Orig. Com. in Joan. p. 46. Δίει πολυθεΐας ψιλὰ καταλιπεῖν τὰ ὀνόματα. Greg. Naz. Orat. 1. p. 16. Ne gentili errore duos Deos adserere convincamur. Vigil. Tapsf. p. 125. Φέβω τοῦ δεῖν δεύτερον εἰσηγείσθαι Θεόν. Euseb. de Ecclef. Theol. l. 1. c. 3. p. 62. Nam si aliter dixerimus dicemur Multicolae. August. de Quinque Haer. p. 16. Unius Naturae probabili quidem confessione deceptus. Vigil. Tapsf. l. 11. con. Eutyph. p. 14.

(2) Epiph. H. 65. Philastr. H. 64. Athanas. & Naz. passim. (3) Epiph. H. 57. Philast. H. 53. Aug. H. 36. Theod. Haer. Fab. l. 111. c. 3. (4) Euf. E. H. l. vi. c. 33. (5) Theod. H. F. l. 111. c. 3. (6) Auct. Catal. Haeret. adfixi Tertull. de Praescript. Haeret. p. 254. (7) Tertull. c. Prax. Philast. H. 54. Aug. H. 41. (8) Phil. H. 54. Aug. H. 41. (9) Iren. p. 138. Ed. Grab. Athanas. adv. Apollin. l. 1. p. 931. l. 11. p. 949.

by

by Ecclesiastical Writers without mentioning their Names') as high as *Simon Magus*; who, as he is often called the Author of all Heresies², was most certainly the Author of this, as is Evident from his own Words³, as well as what is said of him by *Irenæus*⁴, *Epiphanius*⁵, *Cyril of Jerusalem*⁶, *Philastrius*⁷, *St. Austin*⁸, *Theodoret*⁹, and *Joannes Damascenus*¹⁰. What I would infer from these two Propositions is this; that as the Heresy propagated by *Sabellius* about the middle of the Third Century, which consisted in an Opposition to the Doctrine of Three Real and Distinct Persons in the UNITY of the GOD-HEAD, is a manifest Proof that That was the Doctrine then received among Christians: so the same Heresy in the Main being advanced from time to time by Men of Corrupt Minds from the very Age of the Apostles, is a Plain Evidence that the same Doctrine so Opposed was the Successive Faith of the Christian Church derived down from the Apostles, and not an Invention of Later Ages formed at last *into a Mighty*

(1) Interp. Ignat. Epist. ad Phil. p. 100. ad Magn. p. 147. Ed. Voss. Origen. Comm. in Joan. p. 24. 45. 46, 185. & in Matth. p. 470. (2) Euseb. E. H. l. 11. c. 13. Cyr. Hier. Catech. vi. p. 8. Iren. passim. (3) Simon Samaritanus hæc quoque inter cætera in suis Voluminibus Scripta dimittens: Ego sum SERMO Dei, — Ego PARACLETUS, Ego Omnipotens. Hieronym. Com. ad c. 24. Matth. ap. Grab. in Spicileg. (4) L. 1. c. 20. (5) H. 21. p. 55. (6) Catech. vi. p. 87. (7) H. 29. (8) de Haer. ad Quodv. (9) H. F. l. 1. c. 1. (10) de Haer. p. 285. ap. Cotelier. Mon.

Scheme by Athanasius in the Fourth Century.

But to leave this Subject for the present, upon which I may perhaps give you my Thoughts more at large some other time; I heartily ask Pardon for this Digression, and Proceed.

ATHENAGORAS in his Apology, presented to the Emperor, according to Mr. *Dodwell* ¹, in the Year 168, many Years before either *Dionysius* or his Master *Origen* was born, is very Clear and Express when he has occasion to speak of the TRINITY, of which take these few Instances. 'Ενός ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἑντος ᾧ ὃς υἱὸς ἐν πατρὶ, καὶ πατὴρ ἐν υἱῷ, ἐνότη-πι καὶ δυνάμει πνύματος ². Can any thing be more full and satisfactory than this? If any thing can be, it is what follows in the very next Section, where he has these Noted Words ³, Τίς ἐν σοὶ ἀπορήσας λέγοντας θεὸν πατέρα, καὶ υἱὸν θεόν, καὶ πνύμα ἅγιον, δεικνύοντας αὐτῶν τιῶ ἐν τῇ ἐνώσει διύαμιν, καὶ τιῶ ἐν τῇ ταξεὶ διαίρεσιν, ἀκέσας ἀθέετος καλεμύετος; What could *Athanasius* Himself have said more or Clearer? Neither is what follows much less Clear, Εἰδέναι τίς ἢ ὁ παῖδς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐνότης, τίς ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν κοινωνία, τί τὸ πνύμα, τίς ἢ τῶν πούτων ἐνωσις καὶ διαίρεσις ἐνμελῶν, τῷ πνύματος, τῷ παῖδς, τῷ πατρὸς ⁴.

(1) Dissertat. Cyprian. Diff. XI. §. 37. p. 262. (2) Legat. p. 38. Ed. Ox. (3) Ib. p. 40. (4) Ib. p. 46.

And in another place, Ὡς γὰρ θεὸν φησὶ καὶ υἱὸν τὸ λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἐνέμενα μὲ καὶ διδάσκοντες, τὸ πατέρα, τὸ υἱὸν, τὸ πνεῦμα· ὅτι νῦν, λόγος, σοφία, υἱὸς, τοῦ πατρὸς· καὶ ἀπορροία, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα'. And again, Οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἄθεοι, θεὸν ἁγνίζοντες τὴν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγον·.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, whose Scholar *Origen* was *Dionysius's* Master³, has often Expressions full and Clear enough for the fourth Century, as well as *Dionysius*. Ὁ θεῖος λόγος, ὁ φανερώμενος ὁντως θεός, ὁ τῷ δεσπότῃ τῷ ὅλων ἐξισωθείς⁴. Πάντοτε καὶ θεὸν λόγον⁵. Τῶν συμπάντων θεὸν ἕνα μόνον εἶναι—υἱὸν ἐν πατρὶ· ὃν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας⁶. Ὑιὲ καὶ πατὴρ, ἐν ἀμφοῖν, κύριε⁷. Τῷ μόνῳ πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ—σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι· πάντα τῷ ἐνὶ, καὶ ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα· ὃν ἡ δόξα, κ. τ. ε.⁸. To these I might add many more, if you were not already forced to own the *Extravagancy*, as you call it, of *Clemens's Novel Expressions*; which, you say, were not *relished or entertained by the Church in those days*⁹. Evidence, Original Evidence is what you always call out aloud for: you will give me leave therefore, I presume, to ask you upon whose Authority you ground this Positive Assertion. The Name of any

(1) Legat. p. 96. (2) Ib. p. 122. (3) Euf. E. H. l. vi. c. 6. (4) Prot rept. p. 68. (5) Paedagog. p. 236. (6) Ib. p. 119. (7) Ib. p. 266. (8) Ib. (9) *Prim. Christian. Rev.* Vol. 4. p. 2. and Append. p. 15.

one Antient Writer, of that, or any other, Age, who has said this, or any thing like it, would be a Great Satisfaction to me. If you cannot oblige me in this matter, I shall only *Observe* how little Reason you of all Mankind have to complain of the Loss of Old Books, who have so little Need of them, as to be able to know, and *assuredly pronounce*, what was Said, Done, and even Thought in the Second Century without the Least Assistance from any Books or *Records* whatsoever.

TERTULLIAN, *Clement's* Contemporary, writes still much more like an Author of the Fourth Century. Hunc ex Deo prolatum Didicimus, & prolatione generatum, & idcirco Filium Dei, & Deum dictum *ex Unitate Substantiae*. Nam & Deus Spiritus. Et cum radius ex Sole porrigitur, portio ex summa; Sed Sol erit in radio, quia solis est radius, *nec separatur substantia, sed extenditur* (*πλάτύνωμεν ἀδιάρητον*) Ita de Spiritu Spiritus, & de Deo Deus, *ut lumen de lumine accensum*. *Apologet. c. XXI. p. 21.* Dum Unicum Deum non alias putat credendum, quam si ipsum eundemque Patrem & Filium & Spiritum Sanctum dicat: quasi non sic quoque Unus sit Omnia, dum ex Uno Omnia, *per Substantiae* scilicet *Unitatem*; & nihilominus custodiatur oeconomiae Sacramentum, quae *Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit*, Tres diri-

dirigens — non Statu, sed Gradu; nec *Substantia*, sed forma; nec Potestate, sed specie: *Unius* autem *Substantiae*, & *Unius* Status, & *Unius* Potestatis. Quomodo autem *Numerum sine Divisione* patiuntur, procedentes *Retractatus* demonstrabunt. *Contra Praxeam*, c. II. p. 635. *Numerum & Dispositionem Trinitatis Divisionem praesumunt Unitatis*, quando *Unitas ex semetipsa derivans Trinitatem*, non destruat ab illa, sed administretur. *Ib.* c. III. p. 635. *Filio & Spiritu Sancto, Consortibus Substantiae Patris*. *Ib.* c. III. p. 636. *Filium non aliunde deduco, quam de Substantia Patris*. *Ib.* c. IV. p. 636. Haec erit Probola Veritatis, Custos *Unitatis*, qua prolatum dicimus *Filium a Patre*, sed non *Separatum*. *Ib.* c. VIII. p. 639. *Trinitas* — & *Monarchiae* nihil obstitit, & *Oeconomiae* Statum protegit. *Ib.* c. VIII. p. 640. *Inseparatos ab alterutro Patrem & Filium & Spiritum testor*. *Ib.* c. IX. p. 640. Quando *Scripturae omnes & Demonstrationem & Distinctionem Trinitatis* ostendant. *Ib.* c. XI. p. 642. Si te adhuc *Numerus scandalizat Trinitatis*, quasi non *connexae in Unitate simplici*, &c. *Ib.* c. XII. p. 643. *Secunda Persona, Sermo Ipsius; & Tertia, Spiritus*. *Ib.* *Ex Unitate Trinitatis loquebatur*. *Ib.* *Alium — Personae, non Substantiae, nomine; ad Distinctionem, non ad Divisionem*. Ceterum etsi ubique

que teneo *Unam Substantiam in Tribus Cohærentibus*, &c. Ib. Duos tamen Deos & Duos Dominos nunquam ex ore nostro proferimus; non quasi non & Pater Deus, & Filius Deus, & Spiritus Sanctus Deus, & Deus Unusquisque. *Ib. c. XIII. p. 644. Redactum est jam Nomen Dei & Domini in Unionem* (τὴν τετράδα πάλιν εἰς τὴν μονάδα συγκεφαλαιούμεθα) Ib. Sub manifesta & *Personali Distinctione*. Ib. c. XV. p. 646. *Ex Deo Deus*. Ib. c. XV. p. 647. Pater & Filius duo, & hoc non ex *Separatione Substantiae*, sed ex *Dispositione* &c. Ib. c. XIX. p. 651. *Salva Unione Divinitatis*. Ib. c. XX. p. 651. Unum sumus, dicens, ostendit Duos esse quos *aequat*, & jungit. Ib. c. XXII. p. 654. Manifestam fecit duarum *Personarum Conjunctionem*. Ib. c. XXIV. p. 657. *Proprietatem Utriusque Personae*. Ib. Ita Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paracleto, Tres efficit Cohærentes, alterum ex altero, *Qui Tres Unum sunt*, non Unus. Quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus; ad *Substantiae Unitatem*, non ad numeri singularitatem. Ib. c. XXV. p. 657. *Distinctione Patris & Filii*, quam manente *Conjunctione* disponimus. Ib. c. XXVII. p. 659. Videmus Duplicem Statum, non confusum, sed *Conjunctum in Una Persona Deum & hominem*. Ib. c. XXVII. p. 660. Pater & Filius & Spiritus Tres Crediti Unum Deum sistunt. *Ib. c. XXXI. p. 663.*

663. I have been thus Long in my Quotations from *Tertullian*, because many of them may be applied to a Purpose of much greater Moment than barely to Confirm the Authority of *Dionysius's Letters*; At present I shall only desire you to compare the Last of them with an Annotation of your own, *Prim. Christian. Rev.* Vol. iv. p. 48, 9. There you say, that *to call the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, One God, is a strange Way of Speaking*, not to be traced much higher than the *Later days of Athanasius*; whereas here, you see, it is used by *Tertullian* an Hundred and Fifty Years before that time. He does not only *speak as if* he thought so, as you after endeavour to bring your self off; but expressly Affirms it, and that in so many words.

CYPRIAN shews himself in several Places to be no Stranger to the Word *Trinity*, or the Orthodox Doctrine expressed by it. Thus, in his Book *De Idolorum Vanitate*, Hic in Virginem illabitur; carnem, Spiritu Sancto cooperante, induitur. *Deus cum homine miscetur. Hic Deus Noster*, Hic Christus est *. And in his Famous Book *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, Dicit Dominus: Ego & Pater Unum sumus. ET ITERUM DE PATRE ET FILIO ET SPIRITU SANCTO SCRIPTUM EST:

* P. 15. Ed. Ox.

ET HI TRES UNUM SUNT; & quisquam credit Hanc *Unitatem de Divina Firmitate* venientem, *Sacramentis coelestibus cohaerentem*, scindi in Ecclesia posse¹? And in his Treatise *De Oratione Dominica*, In orationibus vero celebrandis invenimus Observasse cum Daniele tres pueros in fide fortes, & in Captivitate Victores, horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, *Sacramento scilicet Trinitatis*, quae in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat. Nam & *prima hora in tertiam veniens consummatum numerum Trinitatis ostendit*. Itemque ad sextam quarta procedens declarat alteram Trinitatem. Et quando a septima nona completur, per ternas horas Trinitas perfecta numeratur: quae horarum spatia jampridem spiritaliter determinantes adoratores Dei, Statutis & Legitimis ad precem temporibus serviebant; & manifestata postmodum res est *Sacramenta olim fuisse, quod ante sic justiprecabantur*². In his Little Tract *De Bono Patientiae* Our Blessed Saviour is called our God and our Lord, *Jesus Christus Deus & Dominus Noster*³, which words are repeated in his LXIII. Epistle to Caccilius⁴. And in the Noted Epistle to *Jubaianus*, *Ite ergo & docete gentes omnes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris & Filii & Spiritus Sancti*. Insinuat *Trinitatem*, cujus *Sacramento Gen-*

(1) P. 109. (2) p. 153, 4. (3) p. 212. (4) p. 148.

tes Baptizarentur. Nunquid hanc *Trinitatem* Marcion tenet*? And a little farther, Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, & sanctificatus est, & templum Dei factus est; quacro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris, non potuit qui in eum non credidit: si Christi, nec hujus fieri potest templum, *qui negat Deum Christum.*: si Spiritus Sancti, cum TRES UNUM SINT, quomodo Spiritus Sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus est†? And again in the same Epistle, Quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari jubeat *in Plena & ADUNATA TRINITATE* §.

IF for One Instance *Desired* as *Early as Dionysius*, so many Earlier will not satisfy you; I have yet one Witness more in Reserve, and that is *Dionysius* Himself: and if you will not take His Word for His own *Style*, I must despair of giving you any Satisfaction in this matter. If you please to consult His *Epistle against Paul of Samosata*, with His Answers to the Ten Questions proposed by that Heretick, you will find that He expresses Himself there after the same Manner as in His Epistles to *Dionysius of Rome*. Θεὸν ὄντα ἀληθινόν, καὶ προσκυνοῦμενον ὡς ἀπὸ πάσης κτίσεως σὺν πατρὶ καὶ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι. Ap. Labbe Conc. Tom. i. p. 853. Εἰς ὅτιν ὁ Χεῖρς, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ πατρὶ συν-αἰδὸς λόγος, ἐν αὐτῷ ὡρόσωπον, ἀόρατος Θεός.

* P. 200. † p. 203. § p. 206.

Ib. Τὸν ἄκτιστον καὶ δημιουργόν. Ib. Ὁμοῦσιον τῷ πατρὶ εἰρημνύον ὑπὸ τῷ ἁγίῳ πατέρων. Ib. p. 856. Τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοειδὴς συνάναρχης λόγος, Χειρὸς ὢν, συναΐδιος τοῦ γεννήσαντος. Ib. p. 864. Αἱ δύο ὑποστάσεις ἀχώριτοι, καὶ τὸ ἐνυπόστατον τοῦ πατρὸς πνῦμα. Ib. p. 865. Ὁ ἐνυπόστατος αἰεὶ ὢν χειρὸς, ὁ ἴσος τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον τῆς ὑποστάσεως ὢν, συναΐδιος καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ πνῦματι. Ib. Θεὸς γὰρ Ἰσραὴλ ἰησοῦς ὁ πρὸς αἰώνων λόγος, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνῦμα. Ib. p. 873. Ἐκ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἐγενήθη. Ib. p. 889.

Learned Men, I confess, are divided in their Opinions concerning the Authority of this *Letter*, so that I cannot offer it as an Uncontested Proof in the Present Case. *Harduin*¹, *Valesius*², and *Ruinart*³, absolutely reject it: Bp. *STILLING-FLEET*⁴, Bp. *BULL*⁵, *Baronius*⁶, *Labbe*⁷, and *Turrian*, who first Published it, receive it as Genuine. *Du Pin*⁸, though he Determines nothing, seems rather Inclined to think it Spurious: Dr. *Cave*⁹, and *Tillemont*¹⁰, though they also Determine neither way, seem rather Disposed to believe it Genuine. In order therefore to satisfy our selves what Weight

(1) Not. in Epist. Chrysost. ad Caesar. p. 241. Op. Select.
 (2) Annot. in Euseb. p. 139. (3) Acta Martyr. p. 187. (4)
 Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, p. 35. (5) De-
 fens. Fid. Nic. §. II. c. xi. p. 148. 9. (6) Ad Ann. 265. n. 5.
 266. n. 2. (7) De Script. Eccles. T. 1. p. 258. (8) Nouvelle
 Bibliotheque T. 1. p. 190. (9) Hist. Liter. Vol. 1. p. 97, 8.
 Vol. p. 53, 4. (10) Memoires T. 4. part. 2. p. 606. 886.

the Passages I have cited from it may be allowed to have in the present Dispute, it will be Necessary to enquire a little into the Reasons which those Learned Men, who reject or suspect it, have given for their Opinion.

THE Chief Objection against this *Letter* and the *Answers to Paul's Questions* is, that in the Synodical Epistle of the Council of *Antioch* it is expressly said, that They had written to *Dionysius*, and that *Dionysius* upon the Receipt of their Letters had written back to *Antioch*, but Directed His Letter to the whole Church (or the whole Province, τῇ παροικίᾳ πάσῃ) not to *Paul*, in which too He had not so much as honoured him with a Common Salutation ¹.

THIS Argument is Historically mentioned by Dr. *Cave*² and *Tillemont*³, and urged by *Du Pin*⁴ as of Great Force, and by *Valesius*⁵ as Decisive and Unanswerable. But in the first place, as Bishop *Stillingfleet*⁶ and

1 Ἐπιστέλλομεν ἡμεῖς καὶ πείρεκαλοῦμεν πολλὰς καὶ ἱερὰς μακρὰς ἐπισκόπων, ἐπὶ τὴν θεραπείαν τῆς θανατηφόρου διδασκαλίας ὡς παρὰ καὶ διονύσιον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ φιρμιλιανὸν τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κερκυραδικίας ὧν ὁ μὲν ἐπέσειλεν εἰς τὴν ἀντιοχείαν τὸν ἡγεμόνα τῆς πλάνης οὐδὲ ἀποστέλλειν ἀξιώσας οὐδὲ πρὸς ἀποστολὴν γράψας αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ τῇ παροικίᾳ πάσῃ. Ap. Euseb. E. H. l. vii. c. 30. p. 228. Ed. Vales.

(2) H. L. V. i. p. 97. V. 2. p. 53. (3) l. p. 887. (4) p. 190. (5) p. 139. (6) It's said indeed, that He did not write to him, i. e. He did not direct it to him, but He might send it to the Council in answer to his Letters, which He mentions. *Vind.* p. 35.

Tillemont have in part Observed, the *Letter* only can be affected by this Objection, and not *the Answers to Paul's Questions*. For in Those He very often speaks of *Paul* in the Third Person, and under no more honourable a Name than that of *the Samosatenian*; and when He does address Himself to him in the second Person, He is far from expressing any the least Respect by it, but does it generally after the same manner as we often find in Controversial Writings, especially where the Point in dispute is of Great Importance, and the Disputants Warm and Zealous, as *Dionysius* particularly shews Himself through the Whole Course of these *Answers*. An *Apostrophe* in such Cases is a very Common Figure, and it must be allowed to be much more Natural and more Usual for a Man in the Heat of Argument to *turn* his Discourse to his Adversary, than in a Letter to speak so frequently of him to whom the Letter is written in the third Person. So that *the Answers* might be a Part of the Letter sent to *Antioch*, or at least annexed to it by *Diony-*

(1) L'Objection qu'on tire du Concile peut ne regarder même que la lettre à Paul. Car pour la reponse aux Objections, elle parle d'ordinaire de Paul comme ne s'adressant à lui, & elle ne le marque que par le titre de *Samosatenien*: de sorte que si elle lui parle quelque fois, on voit bien, que ce n'est point par honneur: mais comme on a accoutumé de parler a ceux que l'on combat. Ainsi cette piece, qui est beaucoup plus longue que l'autre, pourroit avoir fait partie de la lettre marqué par le Concile d'Antioche, ou y avoir été jointe. p. 887, 8.

sius, in order to confirm the Council in their Zeal against *Paul's* Heresy by the Strength of His Arguments, as well as the Authority of His Name and Character. And if *the Questions and Answers* be Genuin, I think there can be Little Reason to doubt but the Epistle is so too ; it being not only directly pointed to in *Paul's* Introduction, but also cited and refer'd to in every one of the *Questions*, and in several of *Dionysius's* *Answers*.

BUT let us Consider the Consequence of this Argument. It proves indeed that this Letter is not that which is mentioned in the Synodical Epistle, in Opposition to Bp. *Bull* * and *Baronius* †, who thought it was : But because *Dionysius*, after He was fully satisfied of *Paul's* Obstinacy and Heretical Pravity, refused to Countenance him so far as to Salute him in a Letter written to the Church of *Antioch*; does it therefore follow, that He never had any Dispute with him before that time by Letters, according to the Custom of that Age, and of *Dionysius* Himself in Particular? *Eusebius* § assures us, that several Synods met before this Affair of *Paul* could be determined, and why might not this Letter be written at the time of one of those Synods, or before any of them? *Dionysius* upon the Rise of

* P. 148. † An. 266. n 2. § Καπε καίρις ἀναφοράς (aut ἀναφοράς) καὶ ποικίλης. E. H. l. vii. c. 28.

any Heresy, was always Ready with the first to oppose it. The *Nepotians*, the *Sabellians*, the *Novatians*, had scarce time to adjust their Heretical Schemes, before He was prepared to confound them. And where is the Absurdity of supposing, that He had as much Concern for the Salvation of Souls, and as Warm a Zeal for the Purity of the Faith at the time when *Paul* endeavoured to corrupt it, as He had lately shewn in Opposition to the other Hereticks above-mentioned; since it is confessed that He heartily detested *Paul's* Heresy, and He could not but think it much more Impious than the Heresy of *Nepos* or *Novatian*, and not less Impious than the Heresy of *Sabellius*, as indeed it was very nigh the same; the Difference betwixt them, if any, consisting rather, as it appears to me, in their Different Way of Explaining the same Notions, or at least in Different Consequences drawn from them, than in the Original Notions themselves?

UPON the whole matter, this Passage in the Synodical Epistle, in all the Force which I can conceive it to have, is so very Weak and Inconclusive an Argument against this Letter, that it may be said to make rather for it than against it; since *Dionysius* was much more likely to put that Affront upon a Man of whose Heretical Opinions He had been fully convinced from
his

his own Writings, and whom He had in vain endeavoured to reclame, than upon a Man charged with an Heresy which he would not own. For we learn from *Eusebius* * and *Theodorit* † and several other Authors, that *Paul* did all he could to conceal his True Sentiments, which *Dionysius* accordingly complains of in His Letter, and labours to extort from him a Plain Confession and Acknowledgement of his Notions.

IT is also Objected by *Valesius*, *Ruinart*, and *Du Pin*, that the Style of this Epistle differs from *Dionysius*'s Style in His other Epistles. But Judgments formed of Books from their Style are generally so Uncertain and Precarious, and depend upon such Nice and Slender Notices, that he who will determine a Book to be Genuin or Spurious upon such Grounds must be Content to Judge for himself only, and allow the same Liberty to other Men, whether of a more Refined or a less Distinguishing Taste than himself. Bp. *Stillingfleet* therefore does not think fit to be so Positive in this matter. He *will not take upon him to Judge how far it differs from His Style in other Epistles*; but yet readily declares, that *the Design is very agreeable to an Epistle from Him on that Occasion*. And indeed it is so very Difficult to determine any thing with

* L. vii. c. 28. † Haeret. Fab. l. 11. c. 8. p. 223.

Certainty this way, that I believe I might Undertake to shew as Great a Difference of Style betwixt the Acknowledged Genuine Works of the same Author, as is often made Use of by Criticks to prove a Book Spurious. No Man does, or can, always write exactly after the same Manner. Proficiency in Knowledge, Honour, Disgrace, Prosperity, Adversity, the Nature of the Subject, the Present Temper of a Man's Mind, His State of Health, Age, and even the Agreeable or Unpleasant Situation of things round about him, will naturally have a Great Influence over his Way of Thinking, and that will as Naturally shew it self in his Way of Writing. Besides, there is a great deal of difference to be made in the present Case betwixt such Authors, as, having spent a Great Part of their Youthful Studies upon forming their Style, Write afterwards for Reputation, and consequently with Great Care and Exactness; and such as neither regarded nor understood the Beauties and Ornaments of Style. Any thing ascribed to One of these Elaborate Writers is much more Easy to be Distinguished by its Style, whether Genuine or not, by the more Artful or more Negligent Construction and Turn of its Periods, by the Greater or Less Purity, or Strength of the Words, &c. but with respect to the other sort of Writers, and of those more particularly most of the

An-

Antient Fathers, all these Helps are in a great measure Wanting, and Consequently it is much more Difficult to determin of the Writings which go under their Names, which are Genuin and which Spurious, from Observations made upon their Style. And this is yet more difficult in the Case of *Dionysius*, because he has left us so very little to form a Notion and *Character* of his Style by.

FROM these Reflections upon the Difficulty of proving a Book Spurious by its Style, I would not be understood to acknowledge, that there is any such Difference here as is pretended betwixt the Style of this Epistle, and of *Dionysius's* other Writings; For I must say with Mr. *Tillemont* *, He who has satisfied himself of this Difference must have examined the matter much more Carefully and Exactly than I can pretend to have done. But let it be Granted that some Difference may be found; wherein does this Difference consist? Is this Epistle not so Easy and Intelligible, as His other Epistles? That, if it really be so, may very well be charged upon the want of MSS. to collate with *Turrian's* Copy; since it is seldom or never known that a single MS. preserves the True Reading throughout, and False Readings

* C'est ce qu'il faudroit Examiner avec plus de soin que nous n'avons pû faire. p. 887.

generally perplex and Obscure the Sense and Style. Or is his Style here more lax, and his Reasonings less Closely Couched than in some of his other Writings? That too, if True, besides that it is Natural enough to any Man in an Occasional Epistle, may also very fairly be accounted for from *Dionysius's* Extreme Old Age.

IT is farther Objected that *Paul's* Notions are represented here after a Different Manner from what they are Generally thought to have been. But it is not *Dionysius's* fault that People will Generally content themselves with a Superficial and Imperfect Knowledge of things. It is not very Easy indeed to get a True and Compleat Notion of the *ἡλικὴ διγμοῖα*, the Real and Original Errours, of the Antient Hereticks; so as to be able exactly to distinguish betwixt their first and Fundamental Tenets, and such Consequential Opinions as flowing Naturally from the Others, and being more Impious and more Odious, were chiefly objected to them by the Orthodox; either to give other Christians a Greater Abhorrence of their Heresies, or to Convince the Hereticks themselves of the Falseness of their Principles from the Blasphemy and Impiety of the Consequences which necessarily followed from them. This, I say, is not very Easy, but he who will not be at the Pains to lay the
seem-

seeming Different Accounts of Different Authors together, and examine them carefully, must not venture to pronounce a Book Spurious, because it does not exactly agree with an Opinion which he has taken up without due Consideration.

IN *the Epistle and Answers Paul* is represented to acknowledge the Divinity and Eternity of the Λόγος, and this indeed may perhaps seem strange to those, who know no more of *Paul's* Heresy, than that he affirmed our Saviour to be a mere Man. "How was it Possible, that *Paul* could at the same time hold the SON of GOD to be Eternal, and our Saviour a mere Man? It cannot be *the Great Dionysius*, who would obtrude such Contradictions upon us. It must certainly be some Ignorant Impostor, who took upon him to personate the true *Dionysius*, and to write an Epistle for Him against *Paul* of *Samosata*, without knowing any thing of *Paul's* Opinions. But this Conclusion is a little too hasty. What if we should suppose that *Paul*, after the Example of *Praxeas* and *Valentinus* *, divided *Jesus* and *Christ*, and made *Jesus* a Mere Man in which *Christ*, or the Eternal Λόγος, inhabited? If this Supposition be admitted, the Difficulty immediately vanishes; and this was really the Case, as we learn not

* V. *Tertull.* c. *Prax.* p. 659. & *Iren.* passim.

only from this Epistle, but also from *Epiphanius* †, and many other Writers. And hence it is that *Photius* * and others make *Nestorius* to have borrowed his Heresy from *Paul* of *Samofata*.

THIS Impious Division of our Blessed Saviour's Person, and the Confession of the Eternity of the *Λόγος*, are the Only Notions I can find mentioned or suggested in the *Epistle* or *Answers*, which can possibly be supposed to clash with the Accounts given of *Paul's* Opinions by other Writers. And as we have the Concurrent Testimony of the Best Authors that both these were really *Paul's* Opinions; so, by the help of the Former, the Latter is very Easily and Naturally Reconciled to that Blasphemous and best known Assertion of his, that our Saviour was a Mere Man. Besides, after all if we should allow that *Paul's* Notions are not represented here exactly after the same manner as by some other Writers, that would afford but a very Weak and Inconclusive Argument against the Authority of this Epistle; since we find many Contradictory and Inconsistent Notions in the Ancient and Modern Heresies, and we are particularly assured that *Paul* studiously endeavoured to conceal his Real Opinions.

HARDUIN goes still farther, and ven-

† H. 65. p. 608, 614, 617. & alibi. * Ep. 35.

tures to affirm very Positively, that this is the Work of *some Rascally Eutychian* † But what may we not expect from a Man, who will Undertake to *Demonstrate* the Doctrine of Transubstantiation from St. *Chrysostom's* Epistle to *Caesarius*? That Learned *Jesuit* has not given us the Least Reason for this Censure, and therefore I shall content myself to Observe, that though there should be found in this Epistle some Expressions which may seem to favour the *Eutychian* Heresy, that would not be a sufficient Reason for rejecting it; since there are several Passages of the same Nature in the Indisputably Genuin Works of Antient Orthodox Writers, *who never Dreamed of such Opinions*, and therefore *could not particularly guard against them in their Expressions*. Besides, *Dionysius* in this Epistle is arguing against *Paul's* Notion that the *Λόγος* was not united in the same Person with the Humane Nature, but only dwelt in it for a time; so that it was Natural enough for Him, in the Heat of Disputation and Opposition, τῇ ἀμετερίᾳ τῆς ἀνθολογίᾳ, to let fall Expressions which might seem too Favourable to the Contrary Extreme, as He had done before in His Disputations against the *Sabellians*, by the Confession of *Basil* and *Athanasius*.

† *Nebulonis alicujus Eutychiani Sunusfistae Figmentum*. Not. in Ep. Chryf. p. 24¹.

ANOTHER Argument brought against the Authority of this Epistle is, that if it had been Genuin, *Athanasius* would most certainly have made some Quotations from it in His Defense of *Dionysius*. But, with all due Submission and Deference to the Judgement of those Learned Men who insist upon this Objection, I must beg leave to say, that if such Negative Arguments be allowed to have any Great force, few Antient Writings, Ecclesiastical or Profane, will bear so severe a Test. Might not the Epistle be Genuin, though *Athanasius* had never so much as heard of it? Or where is the Necessity of supposing, that He must have heard of it, if it had been Genuin? The Constant Opposition and Persecutions of the Hereticks of His own time allowed Him but little Leisure to be very Curious in His Search after Private Letters written against former Hereticks, and addressed to Particular Persons. Or if He did know of this Epistle, what Necessity was there for His Citing it, after He had so fully Confuted the Objections against *Dionysius* from what *Dionysius* himself had wrote purely to Clear and Explain the Passages in his former Writings, upon which those Objections were grounded? This was a full and Decisive Answer, and it was not *Athanasius's* Manner to
heap

heap up Unnecessary Arguments, or to trouble His Readers with a Multitude of Quotations in a Clear Case, which He always particularly avoided.

IT is also Objected by *Du Pin*, "That
 "the Author of this Letter approves of the
 "word *ὁμοούσιος*, and says that it has been
 "applied to our Saviour by the Fathers;
 "Whereas it is Certain that *Dionysius* and
 "the Council of *Antioch* Disapproved of
 "that Word, and that it could not be said
 "in *Dionysius's* Days, that it had been com-
 "monly used by the Fathers. To the first
 Branch of this Objection I answer, that it is
 so far from being Certain, that *Dionysius* Dis-
 approved of that Word, that it is Certain
 from His *Apology*, that He did not disapprove
 of it, but used it Himself. The Council of *An-*
*ti**och*, it is true, rejected it, and they also assure
 us in their Synodical Epistle, that *Diony-*
sus was of their Opinion as to the Impiety of
Paul's Heresy: but this is no Argument that
 He joyned with them in setting aside that
 Term, which was done after His Death,
 and not because even they Disliked the
 Word it self, when rightly understood, or
 the Doctrine it expressed, but to prevent
 Unnecessary Cavils and Exceptions; for
 which Reason it is probable enough that
Dionysius Himself would have con-
 sented to their Determination against it,
 if He had been present at the Council,

not-

notwithstanding His Former Approbation of it. And if *Dionysius* had really been present and Consented to this Determination, even in that Case we could not have concluded that He Disliked the Word before He knew of any bad use made of it: much less therefore can we draw this Conclusion from a Resolution which the Council of *Antioch* came to after His Death, upon the Particular Occasion of the Absurd and Impious Sense fixed upon that word by *Paul* in order to Obstruct and perplex their Proceedings; especially too since we are assured from *Dionysius's* Undisputed Writings (I mean as to those who make this Objection) that he did not disapprove of it, which must at once silence a thousand *Conjectural* Arguments to the Contrary.

THE Second Part of the Objection is, "that it could not be said in *Dionysius's* Days, that the Word *ὁμοῖος* had been commonly used by the Fathers. Mr. *Du Pin*, by the little I have seen of his Works, seems to be a Fair and Candid, as well as a very Learned, Writer; it would therefore be highly Unjust to accuse him of Inserting the word *Commonly* with a Design to give his Argument the Appearance of more Strength than it can possibly have: but I must Observe however that the Author of the Epistle says no such thing, but only
that

that the Word had been used by Holy Fathers of the Church, ὁμοῖον εἰρημῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων *. And that the word had been so used, to omit many other Proofs, we have the Express Testimony of *Eusebius* himself in the following well known Passage, Τῶν παλαιῶν πᾶς λογίς καὶ ὁπιφανῆς ὁπισκόπος καὶ συγγραφέας ἐγνωμένον ὅτι τὸ ἕ πατρὸς καὶ ὑποθεολογίας τῷ τοῦ ὁμοῖον λεγόμενον ὀνόματι †.

IT is farther Objected, that this Epistle has not been quoted, or mentioned, by any Writer, or ever heard of, before it was published by *Turrian*. I don't Understand, I must confess, how any Man can trust his Memory, or his Common-place Book, so far as to affirm this with any Certainty. However, allowing it to be so, against a set Treatise published and addressed to the whole World this Argument may indeed have some Weight, though even in that Case Reason and Experience shew that it will not always hold: but against *the Genuineness* of a Private Occasional Epistle, which might lye neglected and Unknown many Ages, it is, in my Opinion, very Inconclusive.

AND after all, this Epistle is not so plainly Destitute of External Testimony as is pretended; since *Theodorit* assures us, that *Dio-*

* Pag. 856. † Ap. Socr. l. 1. c. 8. p. 22.

nysius did write to *Paul* in order to reclame him, as well as to the Council *. And the Author of the Epistle to the Clergy of *Persia*, under the name of *Athanasius* †, mentions this Letter to *Paul*, and subjoyns a Copy of it, though a very faulty and Imperfect one. The Age of this pretended Epistle to the *Persians* is very Uncertain: but the Latin Version of it is *Antient*, in the Opinion of *the Benedictins*; the Original Greek therefore might very well be much more Antient. But however, as this can not amount to any thing like a direct Positive Proof, that *Dionysius's* Letter is Genuin; so, I think, it must be allowed at least to prove, that *Turrian* was not the first Man who ever heard of it.

THESE are all the Objections I can meet with against this Epistle, which, if Genuin, is most Certainly a very Valuable Monument of Antiquity; for which Cause I was the more willing to examine into the Reasons alledged to prove it Spurious. Much more might have been said to invalidate them: but I fear, as it is, I have been too Long in this Digression. Upon the whole matter, I would not be thought to Interpose my Judgement in this

* Διὰ τῶν γραμμῶν ἐκεῖνα παρήνεσε πὰ ὡροσέκοντα, καὶ τὰς συνελθούσας ἐπισκόπους εἰς τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας παρέστηξε ζῆλον.
Hæret. Fab. l. 11. c. 8. p. 222.

† Op. Athan. Tom. 2. p. 716.

Affair: all I desire is, that the Reader would weigh the Objections and the Answers I have suggested to them together; and as either are thought to prevail, let the Credit given to the Quotations I have made from this Epistle be Greater, or Less.

THUS far however I am secure as to the main Point, that as we have many *Certain Parallels to the Passage restored by the Benedictins*, in *Dionysius's* Other Writings, if this Epistle and the Answers to *Paul's* Questions be Genuin; so though they should be set aside as Spurious, yet those *Passages* of the very same Apologetical Epistle, which I have already quoted from *St. Basil* *, who, you know, had a *Compleat Knowledge of Dionysius's Works*, must be allowed to be above any Exception. Those *Passages* indeed do not give us quite so Distinct and Clear a Description of the Doctrine of the TRINITY IN UNITY; as That to which you *desire a Parallel*: yet since they give us the only Words in that *Passage*, which can be suspected not to have been in Use in the Third Century, *μῆρας* and *τρίας*, and contain the very same Doctrine of the TRINITY, which is more Distinctly Expressed in the other; no Unprejudiced Person can doubt but he who

* P. 20,

wrote the *Passages* cited by *Basil*, might, upon a Proper Occasion for it, express the same Doctrine as Clearly as in that which is cited by *Athanasius*. And if there can be any Occasion, more Proper than another, for a Man to express himself, upon any Subject, as Distinctly and Determinately, as he possibly can; *Dionysius* had most certainly such an Occasion upon that with respect to the TRINITY in an *Apology* written purposely to clear himself from the Charge of Heterodoxy as to that Article, which had been brought against him from his Unguarded and Incautious Expressions in his former Writings.

AFTER this follows another Request to the Gentle Reader, with relation to your Sixteenth *Suspicion*: but I have been already so Long upon this *Observation*, that I shall reserve the Consideration of it, till I come to your *Reflection* upon my *Answer* to that *Suspicion*.

VII. YOUR next *Observation*, I find, is wholly taken up with *the Life of Antony*; from which you had drawn before the Longest, and, in your own Opinion, the Strongest, of all your Seventeen *Suspicions*. For the Credit of the rest therefore, one would think you should have said something in Defense of it: but instead of that, we have nothing here but New Objections, and those, if it be possible,

ble, ten times Weaker than the Former. However, since this is the only Article, upon which you have thought fit to produce any of the *Great deal of Evidence you have in reserve for the Further Confirmation of your Suspensions*, Your Arguments shall be Considered in their Order.

I. YOU Observe, that the Miracles of Anthony have so Evidently tended to Support Notions and Practices, that have no Foundation in the Earliest Antiquity, &c. that there is the Greatest Occasion Imaginable for Suspicion about them. And here if by these *Notions and Practices* you mean the *Modern Monkery*, as you call it, I refer you to what I have already said as to that Matter in my *Answer*: but if you mean *Modern Orthodoxy*, as you rather seem to do, I must take the freedom to tell you, that this is no better than begging the main Question. For unless *Orthodoxy* be *Antichristian*, I desire to know why *Anthony's Miracles* are to be so *Vehemently Suspected* for tending to support it. Nay, allowing it to be as Great a Corruption of the Primitive Faith as you please, allowing it to have been introduced by the Devil, according to a Certain Author; yet you know the same Modest Author † Observes, that the Devil made use

† Prim. Christian. Vol. 4. Append. p. 19.

of several Good things for the *support* of it, such as *the Honour of the Son of God and of His Holy Spirit*; so that you need not deny the Truth of these *Miracles*, because they have *tended to the support of the Athanasian Heresy*, unless you will also deny that any *Honour* is due to the Second and Third Persons in the TRINITY, for the same reason.

2. THESE Miracles, you say, *were first pretended to at a time when the Old Miracles of the Gospel were so far Ceased, &c.* So far Ceased is an Odd Expression, and, I think, not very Easy to be Understood. If in your Philosophical Enquiries you have *Discovered Degrees in Cessation*, and mean that *the Old Miracles were in a Great Measure ceased*, though not quite (besides that this is not only *Gratis Dictum*, but also contrary to all Ecclesiastical History) why must *Antony's Miracles* be thought *the Wonders of a Lye*, because they were *pretended to at a time when the True Miracles were not so frequent as they had formerly been*? If you mean that They were quite *Ceased*, your Argument will be so far the better, that the Consequence will be Undeniable; for then you may easily Demonstrate that *Antony's Miracles* were False, if it be granted you, that they were *pretended to at a time when True Miracles were ceased*.

3. THESE

3. THESE Miracles Generally belong to such Desert Places, where little Good Evidence was to be Expected, and are said to be Chiefly done among such Ignorant and Superstitious Monks, that there is the Greatest Occasion Imaginable for Suspicion about them, and by Consequence about their Historian Athanasius. To pass over the Abusive Epithets, which you have here very Charitably and Judiciously bestowed upon a Number of Men that you know very little of; It is not, I think, the Greatest Wonder Imaginable, that Antony's Miracles should Generally belong to such Places as he Always lived in, and be Chiefly done among such Men as he Chiefly Conversed with. I must also Observe to you, that Athanasius's Honesty does not depend so much upon the Probability of these Miracles as you Imagine, and by Consequence you was quite mistaken in the State of the Case, when you was Graciously pleased to give the Reader leave to suppose Athanasius Honest, upon this Equal Condition, that he will believe the Legend. For though we should allow, that some of Antony's Miracles are Improbable, his Life may yet be written sincerely by Athanasius. He vouches for but one of these Miracles, as done in His own Presence : and for the rest, His Knowledge of Antony's Piety, and His

Prejudice in favour of His Friend might very easily induce Him to receive them, upon the Credit of those *Monks* from whom He had His Accounts. Add to this, that there was in those Early Ages of the Church as General a Disposition to believe such *Miracles*; as there seems to be in this *Free-thinking* Age, to reject and Ridicule them. Whether they were too Credulous, or we rather too Sceptical, or Both, I am not at present concerned to Enquire. It is sufficient for my Purpose, that the Case was so, and that the most Judicious Men of those times readily received such Stories of this Nature, as will not now pass with a Vulgar Understanding. And besides this universal Credulity, if it must not be thought to deserve a better Name, *Athanasius* knew *Antony* to be a Man of Eminent Piety; He knew, that *if a Man be a Worshipper of GOD, and doth His Will, him He beareth*; He had also seen one of *Antony's Miracles* with His own Eyes; All which Considerations put together might very Naturally Incline Him to Believe such things of *Antony*, as may seem very *Improbable* to a Man, as much Prejudiced Against him, as *Athanasius* could be in his Favour.

VIII. YOU Observe lastly that I have given a Bad Character of *the Synod of Tyre.*

Tyre. Really, Sir, I have so; The Fact I confess, but want to see the Crime.

AND now, Sir, Having Dispatched your *Preliminary Observations*, I come to what you call your *Reflections*, in which you pretend to give an Account of my Answers to your several *Suspensions*, sometimes with Great Wit and Pleasantry, and sometimes in Sober Sadness.

1. *THE Sum of my Answer to your First Suspicion*, you say, comes to this: That Violent Party-men may still not be great Knaves; especially if they be Persecuted. [Not Considering that Arius will on both Accounts have an Equal Title to Integrity with Athanasius.] That is to say, I have taken a great deal of Pains to prove an Undeniable General Truth, which after all is so far from being to my Purpose, that it makes as much against me as for me: Whereas you may see, if you think fit to open your Eyes, that my Arguments upon that head are chiefly Particular; Concluding it highly Improbable, that Athanasius would have been a Knave, to support His Party, because if He had been a Knave, it is highly Probable He would have been of the Contrary Party; and that it is neither Charitable nor Reasonable to believe, that a Man would sacrifice His Conscience to the Defense of a Cause, which Conscience only could

make Him Espouse, contrary to His Apparent Interest. And as for the Sagacious Remark, which you have put into a Parenthesis, *Not Considering &c.* I am very willing to Confess that I *Considered* it not, any more than you *Considered*, when you wrote it, what Obligation I was then under to prove *Arius* a Villain. I assure you I do not in the least repent of the Favour, you think, I have Inconsiderately done him.

II. MY *Answer* to your Second *Suspicion* is, you say, *That the Athanasians, who altered the Language and Practices of Christians, because they do not tell us they intended to alter the Faith it self, are not to be esteemed Dangerous to the Church.* In that *Suspicion* all Good People are advised to *be upon their Guard against Athanasius, lest He should prove an Introducer of the Antichristian State; and that because He was a Bold Person, for which you cite Nazianzen, and an Innovator in Religion, for which you quote Montfaucon.* In answer to It, I proved both these Propositions to be False, and the Quotations, upon which they are Grounded, Impertinent. I Observed, That the two Passages brought from *Nazianzen*, and Artfully joyned together, were only Examples of that False Sublime, which is the Character of almost all the Writers

Writers of those times who pretended to Eloquence; That *the Honour* there said to be paid *Athanasius* was not, as you seem Desirous to Insinuate, the Submission of a Party to their Head, but the Love and Veneration of a few *Egyptian Monks* for their Persecuted Archbishop; That there was nothing Unlawful either in the Degree of their Respect, or their way of shewing it; That if it really was Greater than what was Lawful, it does not appear that *Athanasius* claimed any part of it, and it was no more in His Power to restrain the Excessive Respect of His Friends, than the Spiteful *Suspensions* of His Enemies. And as to the Other Part of His Charge, *Introducing new words*, if the Words made use of by the Council of *Nice* be meant, I proved at large that *Athanasius* could not be called *the Introducer* of them, being then but a Deacon, and very Young; and that if He did *Introduce* them, He did well in so doing.

AFTER your *Faithful* Summary of my Answer, you proceed to Animadvert upon two or three Words in it, which, I find, sound very harsh in your Ears. But that a Creed is not at all the worse for being a Contested one, as Mr. Thirlby affirms, I hope he will find few Good Christians in this Age; excepting some through-pac'd *Athanasians*, that will believe him. You had

had declared, that you *abhor'd the thoughts of Imposing any other than an Uncontested Creed upon the Church.* This Notion I could not by any means assent to; *Imposing* a Test, which no body could refuse to take, seeming to me at that time to be a little Absurd. And I am not yet at all disposed to alter my Opinion; neither shall I be, till I see some better Reason against it, than your repeated Declaration of *Abhorrence.* Provided there be nothing inserted but Essential and Fundamental Articles of Faith, which Caution I took care to put in before, I must own I am not yet able to see what there is in a Creed's being *Contested*, to make it so Horrible and Odious. Is it not very Probable, that several Articles were inserted by the Church into the Apostles Creed, purely because they were denied by Hereticks*? Is that Creed *at all the worse* because every Article of it has been Opposed by some Hereticks or other? Is the Article which pronounces GOD THE FATHER, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, the worse for being Contradicted by *Simon Magus, Menander, the Gnosticks, Carpocratians, Cerinthians, Valentinians, &c.* upon which account it is not altogether Improbable that it was first

* Propter nonnullos Haereticos addita quaedam videntur, per quae Novellae Doctrinae sensus crederetur excludi. *Rufin. Comment. in Symb. Apost. p. 170. Ed. Paris.*

put in? Is the Word *Catholick* to be *abhor'd* as *Antichristian*, because very probably inserted in Opposition to the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, or other Schismatics? Was not *the Communion of Saints* added too; and that, in all Probability, as low as the Fourth Century, and for the same Reason?

IN short, if it be an Abominable thing, to *impose any other than an Uncontested Creed*; it is very Ridiculous, in my Opinion, to *Impose any Creed* at all. Creeds were *Imposed* to distinguish betwixt Hereticks and the Orthodox, False and True Christians†; that the Former might not indiscernibly intermix themselves with the Latter, and so Pollute their Holy Rites, and Subvert the Weak: And how can this be effected by *an Uncontested Creed*, which Hereticks will as readily assent to as the Orthodox? The Creed therefore being a sort of a *Tessera Militaris*, or *Symbol**, to distinguish Friends from Foes in this Militant State of the Church; when the Old Creed, by the Artifice of *the Arians*, no longer answered that Design, *the Council of Nice*

† Idcirco istud Indicium posuerunt, per quod agnosceretur is qui Christum vere secundum Apostolicas regulas praedicaret. *Ruf. in Symb.* p. 170.

* Symbola distincta unusquisque Dux suis Militibus tradit—ut si forte occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus Symbolum, prodatur si sit hostis vel Socius. *Id, Ibid.*

wisely made a new One; as a Wary General, if the Enemy chance to get *the Word*, immediately gives out another, that they may not, by the Advantage of it, enter his Camp at Pleasure, to the Ruin and Destruction of his Army.

III. THE Summary you give of my *Answer* to your *Third Suspicion* is this, *Mr. Thirlby* pleads, that my Character of *Athanasius* is false, because it is not agreeable to His own Accounts of Himself, and to the Opinion His own Party have long had of Him. If I had really done so, there would have been more Force in that *Plea*, than there is Wit or Truth in this Representation; nay, I will maintain, it had been a sufficient Answer. The *Suspicion* runs thus, *A Person of His General Character, which I take to be that of one Resolute, &c. cannot but afford Great Room for Suspicion to Considering Men.* Here, if by *General Character* you mean the Character He has Generally had in the World, I have proved, according to your own Account, that He has Generally had a very Different Character; and consequently, that your *Suspicion*, built upon His General Character, is Groundless. If by His General Character you mean His Compleat Character drawn at large, as you there seem to explain yourself, you might as well have said, "A Per-
son

son, whom I take to have been one of
a Bad Character, and of whom I have
conceived a Bad Opinion (though I do
not think fit at present to tell you why)
cannot but afford Great Room for Suspi-
cion to Considering Men. This is your Mo-
dest Conclusion in its full Strength; and if I
had said much less in answer to it, than
you make me to have said, I should yet
have said much more than it De-
served.

IV. MY Answer to your Fourth *Suspi-*
cion, is, you say, *That Epiphanius's Ac-*
count of the Origin of the Melitians must
be False, because it is probable it came
from themselves; and the Contrary must
be True, because it comes from Athanasius

THAT *Suspicion* is grounded upon
the *Different Accounts* given by *Atha-*
nasius and *Epiphanius* of the *Origin of*
the Melitians, from which, and from the
Decision of the *Council of Nice*, which
was more favourable to *these Melitians*
than to the *Arians*, You conclude, that
Athanasius's Account is Unfaithful, and
the Effect of Hatred. To this I answer-
ed, That there is no Reason to question
the Sincerity either of *Athanasius* or *Epi-*
phanius from this *Difference*; and That
the Enquiry ought only to be, on which
side there appears the Greatest Probabili-
ty of Mistake. And in order to Deter-
mine

mine that, I observed, That *Epiphanius* differs from all other Ecclesiastical Writers in this matter, as well as from *Athanasius*; That *Athanasius* lived at the same time, and in the same Country where that Schism arose; That *Epiphanius*, on the Contrary, lived many Years after, and at a place far Distant; so that he could know nothing of this Business but by Information from others, which he was very apt to trust to without much Examination; being, as Learned Men agree, too Credulous in many Instances, and *Probably in this Case imposed upon by a False Account from the Melitians.*

FROM these last Words, which I hope you now see are but a very small part of my Answer, you take Occasion to be so Excessively Witty, at the Expense of Truth, as to make *the Sum* of what I have said upon this Point to be, *That Epiphanius's Account must be False, because it Probably came from the Melitians.* However as little Stress as I then laid upon this *Probability*, since you have made choice of it to be the Subject of your Ridicule, it may not be improper to enlarge a little upon it. That *Epiphanius's Account* came Originally *from the Melitians*, as *Impartial* as you make him to be in this Matter, is very Evident from the Air of Partiality, which runs through the whole Narration;

tion, and particularly from his not saying one word of the Sentence which the Council of *Nice* passed upon *Melitus* and his Followers: And that this Account was *Probably False*, is Clear enough, I think, from the Practice of all Schismatics in all Ages, from the Condemnation of *these Melitians* by the Council of *Nice*, and from the Necessity they lay under upon that account of framing some very Plausible Story of their own *Origin*.

THIS *Probability* was all I then contended for: but since you was pleased to be so very Facetious upon it, you shall see that I had good Reason to call That *Probably False*, which I can easily prove to be Certainly so. In order to that I might Observe, that This Account is in many Circumstances perfectly Incredible, and very Confused throughout, particularly in the Notation of Time; making *Alexander Peter's* Successor in the See of *Alexandria*, and *Achillas Alexander's*. Besides, *Epiphanius's* Story necessarily supposes, and he himself expressly affirms, that *Peter* lay a long time in Prison before His Martyrdom; whereas *Eusebius*, who was in *Ægypt* in that Persecution *, assures us, that He was Beheaded immediately after He was apprehended †. Neither is it at

* H. E. l. viii. c. 9. † L. ix. c. 6.

all Probable, that so Excellent a Bishop, as *Eusebius* tells us *Peter* was, should quarrel with *Melitus* for declaring his Opinion against admitting the *Lapsi* to Communion immediately upon their Repentance, and in the very time of Persecution invite others to follow their Example by professing Himself ready to receive them upon their first Application for Pardon, contrary to the standing Discipline of the Church; This, I say, is not very Probable, especially if it be Considered that he had not long before published some very severe *Canons*, to fix the Different Lengths of the Penance these *Lapsi* were to undergo, according as Different Circumstances aggravated or extenuated their Fault *.

TO your other Argument, drawn from the Determination of the Council of *Nice*, I answered, That there was no Reason why Schismatics *Sound in the Faith* should be punished as severely as the Worst of Hereticks, and that if their Sentence was more *gentle* than they deserved according to *Athanasius*, it was also infinitely more severe than they deserved according to *Epiphanius*; whereas the Council it self expressly says, in Confirmation of *Athanasius's Account*, and in Direct Opposition to the Other, that *Melitus* and *the Melitians* had

* Ap. Bevereg. Pand. Tom. 2.

been more gently dealt with than they deserved†. *The Sum* of this is, you say, *That Athanasius's Account must be True because it comes from Athanasius!*

V. IN your *Fifth Suspicion* you affirm that *Athanasius's Youthful Treatises contain in a manner the same Doctrine that He afterwards opposed*. This I flatly denied, and undertook to maintain that those *Treatises contain nothing contrary to the Catholick Faith, and some things directly contrary to the Arian Heresy*; and challenged you to joyn Issue with me upon that Question, and said all I could to provoke you to accept that Challenge. And what is the Event? Why, it seems, you have the Good Grace to make me the Complement of Understanding these Matters so well as to agree with you in your Judgment, that *these Treatises have not much that is like the Athanasian Notions and Language afterwards*; you would also persuade me, that I never offered any such Challenge, nor ever denied the Truth of what you affirm. For, according to you, all I have pretended to say, in Opposition to that *Suspicion* of yours, amounts to no more than this, *That though Athanasius's first Treatises have not much that is like the Athanasian Notions and Language afterwards; yet we are to suppose that they*

† Synod. Epist. ap. Socr. l. 1. c. 9.

mean the same things; because they were written by Athanasius, who cannot be supposed ever to have Contradicted Himself in these Matters.

IN this pretended Summary you make me to say,

1. THAT *Athanasius's First Treatises have not much that is like the Athanasian Notions and Language afterward.*

2. THAT *though they have not much that is like the Athanasian Notions and Language afterward; yet we are to suppose that they mean the same things.*

3. THAT *we are therefore to suppose that they mean the same things, because they were written by Athanasius.*

4. THAT *the Reason why we are therefore to suppose that they mean the same things, because they were written by Athanasius, is, that He cannot be supposed ever to have contradicted Himself in these Matters.*

I DARE say no other Man but my Sagacious Correspondent Mr. WHISTON could have discovered any of these four Propositions, or any thing like any one of them, in my Answer to that Suspicion: But I shall not trouble my self to Expostulate with you upon the Palpable Injustice of this Representation; it may be perhaps a little more Usefull, to me I am sure it is a much more Pleasant Task, to endeavour
to

to Convince you, that I have some better Arguments for my Opinion that *those Treatises* are not *Arian*, than *because they were written by Athanasius*. In order to that I shall not much insist upon His Calling our Saviour God, as He does no less than forty times in *those Treatises*, neither shall I at present make any Observations upon the Passages I shall produce, though many of them very well deserve it; but set them before you without any Comment, that you may try your Skill upon them, and see how you can reconcile them with *the Notions and Language of Arianism*. Ζῶν-
τα καὶ ἐνεργῇ θεόν, αὐτολόγον λέγω, ὅς ἄλλος μὴ
ᾔδει τῆς γεννητῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως. p. 39. Ὁ
θεὸς ὢν ᾔδει καὶ ὁ σύνθετος διὸ καὶ ὁ τέττα λόγος
ὢν ᾔδει καὶ οὐ σύνθετος, ἀλλ' εἰς καὶ μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ
καὶ ἐκ πατρὸς οἷα πηγῆς ἀγαθῆς ἀγαθὸς πρὸς πάντας
τὰ πάντα ἀγαθοποιεῖ καὶ συνέχει. p. 40. Αἰδῶ
λόγω. Ib. Ὁ παντοδύναμος καὶ παντέλειος ἄγιος ὁ
καὶ πατὴρ λόγος, κ. τ. λ. p. 41. Τὸ γὰρ παρὰ
δοξον αὐτοῦ τῆς θεότητος τετόνται, ὅτι ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐ-
τῷ ἰδύματι πάντα ὁμοῦ, καὶ ὅσα ἐκ ἀγαθῶν,
ἀλλ' ἀθρώως, — ἀειάγει καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖ. Ib. Ὡς
ἐξ ἀναγκῆς εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῷ γεννησάντι, καὶ τὸ
γεννηθέντα σὺν τῷ πατρὶ ἀγαθονοῦν. p. 46. Τῆς
θεότητος αὐτοῦ μαρτυρίαν. p. 47. Διὰ τῆς ἰδί-
ας πρὸς πάντας καὶ ἀγαθοποιήσεως τῆς ὅλων. p. 59.
Ἀφανὴς ὢν καὶ ἀόρατος ἀλλ' ἐργῶν ἀνέφανε.
p. 61. Ἐν τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ σώματι ὢν, καὶ αὐτὸς
αὐτὸ ζῶον ποιῶν, ἐκκόπας ἐκκοποῖ καὶ τὰ ὅλα, καὶ ἐν

τοῖς παῶσιν ἐγένετο, καὶ ἔξω τῆς ὄλων ἦν. Ib. Παν-
 ταχὺ τιμὴ ὁ λόγος θεοτότου· βλέπων, ὁδὸν ἐπιμὴ
 ἀπατάται πρὸς θεοῦ, μόνον ὃ τῷτον προσκυνοῖ, καὶ
 δι' αὐτὸ καλῶς τὸ πατέρα γινώσκει. p. 87. Ἐπὶ
 ὃ τὸ χεῖρον καταφύγεται, καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν προσκυνῶν-
 τες, δι' αὐτὸ καὶ ὃν ὁδὸν ἡδεῖσαν πατέρα γινώσκουσιν.
 p. 88. Ἐγνωρίσθη θεὸς ἀληθινός, θεὸς θεὸς λόγος.
 Ib. Προσκυνῶσι χεῖρον, θεὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογοῦντες.
 P. 93.

VI. *THOUGH* the Arians did a long time publicly Accuse Athanasius of the Murder of Arsenius; and that perhaps after the time when He says He had openly produced Him alive; yet are Athanasius and His Followers to be believed, that he was certainly then alive.

THOUGH the Arians did publicly accuse Him of this Murder yet may we very safely believe that Arsenius was then alive, upon the Authority of the Ecclesiastical Historians, and many Writers of that Age, supported by the Confessions of those who contrived that Villainous Accusation; neither does it require any Great Degree of Credulity to believe, that a Man may be Innocent although He be Accused. As for the other Clause (and that perhaps after the time when He says He had openly produced him alive) I made you no such Concession. You affirmed at random, that the Arians did Still All His Life accuse Him publicly upon All Occasions of the same Mur-

Murder. This I thought a little too much to believe upon your Bare Word for it, and therefore I made a very Reasonable Request to you, which was that you would be so kind as to mention one of those *Publick Occasions* for my Satisfaction; and that you might see I had some Grounds for refusing my Assent to that General Assertion of yours, I shewed that they did it not upon the two first and most proper *Occasions* Imaginable for that purpose. And indeed it is Notorious, that they had several *Publick Occasions* offered them afterwards to make out the truth of this Accusation, which yet they did not think fit to make use of. For did they do it at the Synod of *Rome*, assembled at their own request* for a rehearing of *Athanasius's* Cause? Did they do it at *Sardica*, though often called upon by the Council†, and importuned by *Hosius*‡, to produce what they had against Him, either Publickly before the Synod, or in private before himself only, with the promise of a fair Hearing, and a Just Censure if they made good their Accusations? No: these were *Occasions* too *Publick* for their Purpose.

TO *accuse Publickly*, I should think,

* Socr. E. H. l. 11. c. 11. Soz. l. 111. c. 7. Julii Epist. ap. Athanas. Apolog. contra Arian. p. 142, 143, 146.

† V. Epist. Syn. Sard. ap. Athan. Apol. p. 156. 163. &c.

‡ V. Hosii Epist. ap. Athan. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. p. 370.

should mean to charge a Man Openly, in a Lawful Assembly, where, upon hearing the Evidence and Allegations on both sides, he might either be Acquitted or Condemned: but this *fair Method of Procedure* they could not be persuaded to submit to. If indeed to *Accuse Publickly*, and to *Convict*, means no more than, in your way, *Fortiter Calumniari*, to bait a Man with Scandalous Libels, and Groundless *Suspicions*; then I confess, it may be true, that they did *accuse Him Publickly* enough upon many Occasions: and such an Accusation it was, which the *Arian* Bishops seem desirous to Insinuate, as Warily as they could *, after they had refused the *Publick* Hearing offered them at the Council of *Sardica*.

THE rest of my Answer, you say, comes to this: *That though That Emperor, whose pretended Letter expresses his Surprize at That Impudence of His Adversaries, soon banished Him notwithstanding, yet are Athanasius and His Followers to be believed, That That Letter of the Emperor is Genuine.* After I have Observed to you, that you do not Pretend to give any Account of my Answers to Two of your Four Objections upon this Head; I must put you in mind, that

* V. Hilar. Fragm. col. 437.

this is so far from being *the Sum* of my Answer, that it is the Sum of one of your own Arguments, and that almost in the very same Words, without taking the least Notice of any thing said against it.

VII. THE *Sum* of my Answer to your Seventh *Suspension* is, you say, that *Athanasius's Account of Anthony's Miracles* is not to be Suspected, since it does not directly tell you, they were to serve the Turn of a Party. The Consequence you would Ridicule here, is not, as you very Ingeniously insinuate, that *Athanasius* does not challenge Assent to His Doctrine upon the Authority of these Miracles, therefore His Account of them is True: but This, *Anthony's Miracles* were not contrived and alledged, either by himself or *Athanasius*, for Testimonials to the *Athanasian Cause* and Doctrine; therefore one of Mr. Whiston's Arguments, drawn from the Supposal of their being so contrived and alledged, is False and Groundless. This Argument you should either have defended, or fairly given up, instead of Confounding General and Particular Conclusions; upon which single Artifice or Mistake, all that Vast Deal of Wit and Humour, which enlivens these Judicious *Reflections*, entirely depends. But to proceed in your Summary.

AND since many Admirers of *Athanasius* and of Monks tell us several Sto-

ries, as well attested, of the like Miracles done by others afterwards. This I perceive is meant for *the Sum* of what I have said to take off your Objection of *Incredibility* against *Antony's Miracles**; though of three Observations made upon that Head, this, which you would here Burlesque, is far the Weakest; each of the other two being of it self a sufficient Answer, and this only a Collateral Argument. However though it be the Weakest of the Three, it will stand the Force of Stronger Objections than any you have brought against it. Your first Exception is, that the Writers, from whom we have these Accounts of *the like Miracles done by others*, were *Admirers of Athanasius*. In this there is not the least Appearance of an Argument, unless we suppose that the Author, who dares presume to mention *Athanasius* with Honour, ought never to be believed in any Case whatsoever; Or that the Ecclesiastical Historians and other Writers, who *tell us* of these *Miracles*, had *Athanasius's* Life of *Antony* in view, and being His *Admirers*, and consequently very Sollicitous about His Reputation, wisely foresaw, that a *Vehement Suspicion* might some time or other be raised against His *Integrity* from

* *Answer* p. 59.

the Incredible Nature of the Miracles recorded in that *Life*, and therefore forged many other Miracles equally Improbable, purely to keep *Athanasius* in Countenance. Your Second Exception, that these Writers were *Admirers of Monckery*, is an Invidious Reflection, but no Argument. And that these Miracles were not *contrived* for the Credit of *Monckery*, any more than for the Defense of *Athanasius*, is plain from the Miracles ascribed to many who were no Monks, and particularly to *Spyridion*. Your Last Exception is, that *these Miracles* are said to have been *done afterwards*, which is utterly false; two of the Three Persons mentioned, and many of those refer'd to, being *Antony's* Contemporaries. And if all of them had been *done afterwards*, this would be so far from making them Unserviceable, that it would make them more Serviceable, to *Athanasius* in this point; by furnishing an Answer to another Objection of yours, that *Miracles* were then very far ceased.

ESPECIALLY since the Apparent Inconsistencies therein may by some Artful Turns be Tolerably Reconciled. To this I shall only answer, that if they be Tolerably Reconciled, they are no longer Apparent Inconsistencies, unless by Apparent you mean the Appearance only; and if these Artful Turns be Forced and Strained, and not

not Plain and Easy, you should have laid open the Artifice, and shewn wherein the *Reconciliation* is Deficient.

VIII *THE Sum* of my Answer to your next *Suspicion* is, that *Athanasius*, who was *Orthodox* is more to be believed, than *Eusebius*, who was a sort of *Arian*. You affirmed there, that *Eusebius's Integrity* was too well known to have that of *Athanasius* come in the least *Competition* with it. In answer to this I Observed, That the most Learned of the Present and Past Ages were almost equally divided in their Opinions, whether *Eusebius* was *Orthodox*, or an *Arian*; That those, who think him *Orthodox*, could not be so well assured of a Man's *Integrity*, who, at the same time as he was *Orthodox* in his Heart, acted in Conjunction with the *Arians* in their Persecutions and Violent Practices against the *Orthodox*; That the Others were as little Able to account for his Letter to his Diocese, and his subscribing the *Nicene Creed*; And I might have added, that you yourself, as well assured of his *Integrity* as you think fit to be there in the *Preface* to your *Primitive Christianity*, begin to doubt, before you come to the End of the fourth Volume, that one of his Reasons for *Subscribing* was *Fear of Deprivation**. This I said, not with any Design to raise a *Sus-*

* Append. p. 16.

picion concerning Eusebius, but only to shew, that his *Integrity* was not so well known, as to be Dangerous to *that of Athanasius* in the Comparison. To this I added as follows, *According to Mr. Whiston, Eusebius was an Arian; and if he was, must one Party-man be thought a Knave, because another Contradicts him? Is not the one as Likely to think too well of his Friends, as the other too ill of his Enemies? &c.* By this time, Sir, I hope even you your self are Convinced, that there is a Double Falseness in this Representation; first in making me give *Athanasius* the Preference because He *was Orthodox*, and Secondly in making me say *Eusebius was a sort of Arian*; when it was so very plain, that what I said upon supposal he was *an Arian*, was only an Argument *ad Hominem*, nay when I had expressly declared that it was no more, in the Following Words: *This I bring only as an Argument ad Hominem; Whether Eusebius was an Arian or not, is what I do not pretend to determine.* But to proceed,

AND if Marcellus was an Heretick, we are to own that Athanasius at last discarded him as such. We are so, and that because, as I then Observed, it is Impossible to prove him an Heretick, without proving the other at the same time; two of the Principal Witnesses against Marcellus directly affirming it. And it is plain from
almost

almost every Page of *Athanasius's* Works, that He was no more inclinable to the Heresy of which *Marcellus* was accused, than to *Arianism*.

IX. YOUR Epitome of my Answer to your Ninth Suspicion is this, *We must believe Arius died by a Divine Stroke, notwithstanding the Uncertainty of the Accounts; the Chronological Inconsistences; the Arians Denial of it; the no mention of it in twenty Years; the Unacquaintedness of the Bishops of Egypt with it, and while the first Accounts of it were not to be Transcribed.*

HERE, Sir, I must Observe in the first place, that you have Covertly altered the State of the Question: The Dispute betwixt us before was not whether *Arius* died by a *Divine Stroke*, but whether *Athanasius's* Account of his *Miserable Death* might be depended upon; The Controverted Point was the Truth of the Fact, and not of the Consequence *Athanasius* draws from the Remarkable Circumstances of it. Whether those Circumstances, when put together, are a sufficient Ground for Interesting Providence in that Affair, is a Question in which the Credit of *Athanasius's* Judgment may perhaps be concerned, but it is the other only which can possibly affect His Integrity.

THE Uncertainty of the Accounts I have denied, and fully disproved : Neither can it well be supposed Possible, that any Piece of History should be more *Certain* at this Distance of Time, or come down to us better attested; being not only asserted by the Ecclesiastical Historians, *Rufinus*, *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodorit* (of whom *Socrates*, as he himself tells us*, was a Native of *Constantinople*, where the Scene of this Fact is laid) but also frequently appealed to by many other Writers in their Disputations against *the Arians*, and particularly by *Nazianzen*, who was Archbishop of *Constantinople*, in several Orations, one of which at least was spoken in that City. "I am not the First, says he, who has
 "preached to you the Orthodox Doctrine,
 "I have followed the Steps of Others, and
 "indeed your own, if you be the Disciples
 "of your Glorious Bishop *Alexander*, that
 "Great Defender of the Doctrine of the
 "Trinity, who confuted the *Arian* Heresy
 "by his Actions as well as by his Arguments;
 "For you remember that Apostolical Prayer of his, by virtue of which
 "the Author of that Heresy perished in a
 "place as filthy as his own foul tongue †.

THE Chronological Inconsistencies you Objected are two; one of which I clearly

* L. v. c. 24. † Orat. xxv l. p. 464.

disproved, and the other I shewed to be of no Consequence, but rather a Proof that *Rufinus* did not transcribe *Athanasius*, and thereby a farther Confirmation of the Truth of the Fact, than an Argument against it; *Rufinus* being an Author so very Faulty in the Notation of time, that if every Fact, which he has placed under a false Date, was therefore to be suspected, Ecclesiastical History, so far as he has proceeded in it, would be very Uncertain in many Particulars of Unquestionable Truth.

THE Arians Denial of it is a New Argument, and, I think, of no great force. But allowing it to be a good one, I believe you will find it a Difficult Matter to prove, that *the Arians* ever *denied* the Fact, whatever they might think of the Conclusion, which the Orthodox made from it. It was not *denied*, I am sure, by those of his Sect, who accounted for the strange Circumstances of it, by charging it upon *the Magical Arts* of the Orthodox †; and that *Arian* ¶ who afterwards built an house upon the Place, in order to obliterate the reproach, took a very odd way of acquainting the World with his *Denial* of the Fact.

THE no mention of it in 20 Years by any body, nor in 40 by any but Athanasius

† Soz. l. 11. c. 29. ¶ Id. l. 11. c. 30.

(though

(though within less than 50 Years it is mentioned and appealed to, as a thing known and Confessed, by several Writers) may be allowed perhaps to have the Appearance of an Argument, when you can name any Author within that time, who has made *no mention of it*, when he had any Occasion to do it.

THE Unacquaintedness of the Bishops of Egypt with it, is what I have been so far from granting, as you seem to insinuate, that I have fully answered the Arguments you bring to prove it, as also what you have said about *the Caution of taking no Copy*. And I humbly Conceive, that there is a great deal of Difference betwixt a Repetition and a Reply.

X. XI. XII. XIII. XIV. *THE Sum of my Answers to your Five Next Suspensions, you say, is This: We must believe Athanasius's Authority to be so Sacred and Inviolable, that let the Suspensions look never so Strong, let the Assertions He quotes be never so Extravagant; let them be never so Contrary to the known Opinions of the same Authors, and to other Ancient Testimonies concerning them; Let Petavius, nay let Origen, Basil, Jerom, Photius, and Others, say what they please to the Contrary; He is still to be believed before and against them all: And there can be no sufficient Reason given, to doubt of His*
Ho-

Honesty and Fairness, in any Case whatsoever.

THIS I have answered, as much as it needs, and much more than it deserves, by Transcribing it. The most Negligent Reader, upon the most Transient View of those *Answers*, will soon see whether this Representation be Just or not: If it be, I must own my self to be an Egregious Trifler; If it be not, you may perhaps be in danger of being thought at the same time a very Trifling Writer, and not altogether so great a Lover of Truth as you pretend to be.

XV. YOUR Summary of my Answer to your Fifteenth *Suspicion* is, *That the Council of Antioch did agree with the Council of Nice; because I am able to suppose how they may be Reconciled in their Direct Contradictions; though I cannot pretend to have the Least Original Evidence for such a Reconciliation.* Here, though scarce any thing in the World could be more for your Advantage, both as to your Grand Quarrel with Orthodoxy, and your Private Pique against *Athanasius*, than to prove that the two Councils were of Different Opinions; yet instead of answering, or pretending to answer, my *Reconciliation*, you content your self with this single Exception against it, *that I cannot pretend to have the least Original Evidence*

dence for it: Whereas on the Contrary I have strengthened and confirmed it from the *Synodical Epistle* of that Council, the most Proper *Original Evidence* in this Case, and have also *Pretended* at least to more *Evidence* than you have pretended, or ever can pretend, to disprove upon any tolerable Grounds from History and Antiquity.

XVI. *THOUGH Hilary and Phæbadius do Almost expressly Contradict Athanasius about the Arianism of Hosius; and though Faustinus and Marcellinus do expressly Contradict Him therein; yet is Athanasius to be believed before them all, whatever they may say about that matter.*

I THINK I have already sufficiently shewn that neither *Hilary*, nor *Phæbadius*, nor *Faustinus* and *Marcellinus* do either expressly or almost expressly *Contradict Athanasius*: but because you desire that this matter may be a little more Considered, I shall very willingly suggest to you in short what I have farther Observed upon a Repeated Consideration of the whole Affair at your Desire.

ATHANASIUS's Account of it is, in your own Words, that Hosius at his Death declared, that what he had done in that Matter was by Compulsion; and that Hosius did then Anathematize the Arians. By this Famous *next* *there* *is* *Athanasius's Fi-*

delity is to be *Tryed*, and the *Witnesses* against Him are to be these *Western Writers*. Now besides what I have already said, *Hilary* owns that Fear of Banishment was *Hosius's* Motive *: and as to his and *Phæbadius's* Writing against Him without Hopes of his Recovery or Tidings of Recantation, *Athanasius* does not pretend that he made this Declaration till just before his Death; and therefore that Objection does not reach the Question, as I have largely proved in my Answer to it.

BUT *Faustinus* and *Marcellinus* are your Two Principal *Witnesses*: and yet even They expressly affirm, that what *Hosius* did in that Matter was upon the

* Sepulchri sui nimium amantem. *Hilar. de Synod.* col. 360.
I shall not now dispute whether the Meaning of these Words be that *Hosius* was too Tender of his Old Carcass, as I find some Learned Men understand them; or rather that he was too Desirous to sleep in the Sepulchre of his Fathers, which was the Sense that occurred to me upon reading them, and for which I think there may be Good Reasons given. I cannot deny indeed but it is agreeable enough to St. *Hilary's* Bold and Figurative Way of Writing, to Understand the Word *Sepulchrum* as these Learned Men do: but however, since Fear was certainly the Cause of his Prevarication, I am not much concerned to enquire whether it was the Fear of Banishment, or of Death or any other Punishment. Neither do I understand it of Banishment to serve my own Purpose, for it is rather more to my Purpose that it should be the Fear of Death; since the Greater the Threatenings were which were thought Necessary to be used, the Less is the Probability of a Voluntary Compliance.

Principle of Fear †; and are therefore so far from *Expressly Contradicting Athanasius*, that they exactly agree with Him as to the Truth of what He makes *Hosius Declare*; and at the same time furnish us with a very good Argument that *Hosius* did really *Declare* this upon his Death-bed. For it is highly Improbable, that he, who had been so Zealous a Defender of the Orthodox Faith for *so many Years*, should not *at his Death* Abjure that Heresy, which he had a little before been frightened into a Compliance with. If Fear of Banishment, or any other Punishment, was the Motive of his going over to *the Arians*, when that Motive could no longer work upon him, as it certainly could not at the Near Approach of Death, what could hinder him from returning to the Profession of that Faith, *for* which he had so long *Contended earnestly*, and *declaring* the Truth (for the Ease of his own Conscience, and in order to prevent the Mischief which might be done by Arguments drawn from his Example and Authority) that Fear of Suffering, not Conviction of

† Sed & ipse Osius, Potamii querela arcessitus ad Constantium Regem, minisque perterritus, & metuens ne senex & Dives exilium proscriptionemve pateretur, dat manus Impietati, & post tot annos praevaricatur in Fidem. *Lib. Precum* p. 14. *Ed. Ox.* Eodem terrore quo Ipse cesserat. *Ibid.*

Mind, was the Principle upon which he acted in that Prevarication?

HERE I suppose you will readily reply, and I think it is the only Objection which can be made, that *Hosius dy'd suddenly upon one of his Acts of Persecution*, and Consequently had not time to make this *Recantation*. But in this you misrepresent the Sense of your *Witnesses*. They do not affirm, *that he dy'd upon that Act*, as you pretend; all they say is this. "As *Hosius* was just going to pronounce Sentence, of a sudden his Mouth was Distorted, and his Neck drawn awry, and tumbling down from his Seat to the Ground he there Expired; or, as some say, was struck Speechless: However, he was Carried off for Dead*." This does not at all clash with *Athanasius's* Account; for he might be Carried off for Dead, and Die soon after, and yet have time enough to *declare* his Repentance. Nay, if this Story be True, it is so far from destroying *Athanasius's* Account, that it is rather a Confirmation of it; since this sudden Stroke from Heaven must necessarily awaken his Conscience, and make him still more ready to *Declare*

* Ecce repente Osius, cum sententiam conatur exponere, os vertit, distorquens pariter & cervicem, de sessu in terram eliditur, atque illic expirat; aut, ut quidam volunt, obmutuit. Inde tamen effertur ut Mortuus. *Lib. Prec. p. 16, 17.*

his Sorrow for that Crime, which had pul-
led down this terrible Judgement upon his
head. And that *Hosius* did not *dye upon* that
Act, is farther Confirmed by a Letter of
Eusebius Bishop of *Vercelli* to *Gregory*
Bishop of *Eliberis*, in answer to an Ac-
count sent him by that *Spanish* Bishop of
the Brave *Resistance* he had made against
Hosius *, in which there is not a word
of *Hosius's* Death; an Incident which we
cannot suppose that either *Gregory* in his
Account, or *Eusebius* in his answer, could
possibly pass over, if *Hosius* had really *Dy'd*
upon that *Act of Persecution*; for that the
Resistance mentioned in *Eusebius's* Epistle
is the same with that which the two Pres-
byters give us this Large Relation of, will
not easily be denied, I believe, by any
Man who has Compared and Considered
them. Many other Arguments might
be offered: but it is altogether needless
to dwell any longer upon this Matter, after
your own *Witnesses*, upon a little Cross-
Examination, have rather Confessed, than
Denied, the Truth of the Fact.

ALL your *Witnesses* have now been heard,
and there remains nothing for you to do, but
to give Sentence, and pronounce your *Judge-*
ment upon the whole; which I find you have

* Litteras sinceritatis tuae accepi, quibus, ut decet Episco-
pum & Dei Sacerdotem, Transgressori te Officio didici restituisse
&c. *Hilar. Fragm. col.* 433.

done in the following Words. *In Reality, so far as I can Judge of that Eminent Person's Conduct in these Matters; As he dislik'd the Rash and Novel Expressions of Arius, and his peculiar Followers; and thereupon heartily join'd against them, both at and after the Council of Nice; so did he in some time, join heartily against Athanasius and His Followers, when he perceiv'd they took Occasion from the Condemnation of the Former, to introduce a more Dangerous Heresy on the other Extreme.*

HOSIUS, whatever the Rigid *Luciferians* might think of him, has not deserved so ill of the Orthodox by this single Instance of Human Frailty, as to be given up to the *Arians*; and therefore to do Justice to his Memory, and at the same time to compleat the Performance of the Promise I made you at the End of my Reply to your Sixth *Observation*, I shall prove to you very briefly, that this New Character, which you have drawn for him, is Groundless and False, and directly Contrary to the *Testimony* of every one of your own *Witnesses*. And 1. To omit his Letter to *Constantius*, which I suppose you will except against because it is given us by *Athanasius*, He Presided and Subscribed in the Council of *Sardica*, above twenty Years after the Council of *Nice*, and till that time therefore was

perfectly Orthodox, and an *Heartly* Friend to *Athanasius*. 2. The old *Arians*, who, I presume, were better *Judges of his Conduct*, than you will pretend to be, had a very Different Opinion of him. The *Arian* Bishops, for example, who refused to sit in the Council of *Sardica*, Anathematize and Excommunicate him over and over, as one who had *always from the beginning* favoured and *joyned* with *Athanasius* and *His Followers*, and acted in Opposition to them and their Interest *. 3. Your own *Witnesses*, and several other Writers, assure us, that what *Hosius* did at *Sirmium*, in Compliance with the *Arians*, was extorted from him by the Violence and Menaces of *Constantius*; which sort of Arguments would have been altogether Needless, if he had before perceived that the *Athanasians* had Introduced a more Dangerous Heresy than *Arianism*. *Hosius* therefore did not Join against the *Athanasians*, till a little before his Death, above 30 Years after the Council of *Nice*; and then, not *Heartily*, as you pretend, but Unwillingly, as your *Witnesses* confess. 4. Your Chief *Witnesses*, and *Hosius's* Greatest Enemies, the two *Luciferian*

* His itaque ac talibus junctus ab initio Ossius, sceleratis semper favens, contra Ecclesiam Dei veniebat, & inimicis Dei semper ferebat auxilium. Decret. Synod. Orient. apud Sardi-
cam, inter Fragmenta Hilar. col. 447.

Presbyters, notwithstanding it was their Principle to abhor him, and their Interest to defame him, do not only acknowledge the Violent Methods used to pervert him, but also farther assure us, that he continued Zealously Orthodox till that *time*; having just before *Detected Potamius*, and Excommunicated him *as an Impious Heretick*, for *Prevaricating* and going over to the *Arians*†. And what your other two *Witnesses* say of *Hosius* necessarily implies that he persevered in his Orthodoxy till this Unfortunate Accident at *Sirmium* not long before his Death. Lastly, This Character, depending entirely upon the Supposition that *Hosius* was neither forced nor frightened into this Compliance with the *Arians*, cannot be True if that be False, as I have proved it to be, and may yet be False though that should be True; since even in that Case it would be a much more Probable Account of *Hosius's Conduct in these matters*, to say he began to Doat, for he was then an hundred Years Old, than that he began to *perceive* the *Dan-*

† Potamius, Odyssiponae Civitatis Episcopus, primum quidem Fidem Catholicam vindicans, postea vero praemio fundi Fiscalis, quem habere concupiverat, fidem praevaricatus est. Hunc Osius de Corduba apud Ecclesias Hispaniarum & detexit & repulit ut Impium Haereticum. Sed & ipse Osius, Potamii querela arcessitus ad Constantium Regem, minisque perterritus, &c. *Libell. Precum* p. 13, 14.

ger of *the Other Extreme*, which he could not perceive for thirty Years before.

XVII. *THE Sum* of my Answer to your Last *Suspension* is, you say, *That because you express your self with Modesty and Caution in some Cases, and had not alledged your Evidence in particular, you are to be supposed to have not much to say farther; and so you are to be laugh'd out of Countenance for all these your Suspensions concerning Athanasius.*

THAT *Suspension* deserved no Answer at all, much less a Serious Answer, and indeed was laid so wide as scarce to admit of any; being nothing but a General Charge of *Monuments unsupported by any other Original Testimony* (which I had answered before) of *Stories almost Incredible, and Chronological Inconsistencies*. The Instances you had given of *Incredible Stories related by Athanasius* I had examined in their places, so that I had nothing more to do there, but to take Notice of the Word *almost* in *Athanasius's* Favour; having, as I thought, some reason to believe, that they, who had Observed the Boldness of your Assertions upon all Occasions, and your great Prejudice against *Athanasius*, would be very apt to Imagine, that those *Stories*, which seem no more than *Almost Incredible* to you, might appear Credible enough to a
Per-

Person of less Warmth and Partiality. Not that I should pay the less Deference to any Author's Judgement, for *Expressing himself with Modesty and Caution*, if it be his Usual Way of Writing; I should rather take it to be a very Good Proof of his Judgement that he did so: but this I think I might venture to say, that an Author, who, is Generally very Confidently in the wrong, is not very Likely to be in the right, when he distrusts himself. He who can be very Positive, without the Least Reason on his side, seldom *expresses himself with Diffidence*, without very Good Reason for it.

TO the Charge of *Chronological Inconsistencies* I answered, what I now repeat, that if you had, or have now amongst your *Great Deal of New Evidence*, any such to produce; it would be much more for the Advantage of your Cause to Communicate them to the World, than such Trifling Objections, as several of your *Suspensions and Observations* manifestly are. And if you really find your self in any Danger of being *laugh'd out of Countenance for them*, your only Remedy will be, to give over pretending to blast the Credit of Great and Good Men by such *Ridiculous* Objections; for you have taken sufficient Care already not to be *laugh'd out of Countenance for any Modesty or Caution* in your Way of Proposing and *Expressing* them.

I HAVE

I HAVE now gone through your *Reflections*, and finished the Unpleasant Task of Detecting so many Disingenuous Misrepresentations: If you think to defend them by a Misrepresentation full as Disingenuous as any of them (*viz.*) that you have written here *somewhat in my way*, and *allowed your self a little of my Liberty of representing things, or of putting Colours upon them*; I shall say no more to it at present, than that whenever you shall shew me one Instance of the like Disingenuity in my *Answer*, or in any part of *Athanasius's Works*, I engage my self entirely to give up the Defence of them both.

SO much for your *Observations*, and *Reflections*; I come now to your Character of the *Athanasian Way of Writing*, given, as I suppose, in order to explain the Compliment you was pleased to make me in the first Sentence of your *Letter*, that I *write much after the Way of Him whom I defend*. As for *Athanasius's Way of Writing*, I have already said something in Vindication of it; and upon this Fresh Occasion I shall only Observe one thing more, which is, that the Fathers of the Church in all Ages, following the Example of the Apostles and Apostolical Bishops, have always wrote against Hereticks in the same manner: Fired as they were with a Noble Zeal for the Purity of *the Faith*, they con-

tended

tended for it more earnestly, because they were more heartily concerned for it, than this Latitudinarian Age of Lukewarmness and *Gal-lionism* seems to be. And as for my self, If, whilst I sought for Instruction in the Writings of those Holy Men, I have been Insensibly * Inspired with some Degree of their Warmth and Vehemence against Hereticks; I hope I may safely oppose their Authority to your *Ill-grounded Reproach of Unchristian Treatment*, in which I have the honour to be Joyned with Bishop *B U L L* †. However, it seems this *Unchristian Treatment* you have met with from me has not been able to provoke your Christian Temper to any thing like a Retaliation; so far from it, that I have here your *Hearty Prayers* for my *Repentance and Pardon*. This is the True Spirit of *Primitive Christianity* indeed. Who would not think, that Mr. *Whiston* had been called *Knave* and *Ignoramus* a thousand times over; whilst he, Good Man, is so far from Offering or Deserving the Least Ill Usage, that he dares not return the Greatest; but, according to

* Fatebor aliquid tamen, ut cum in Sole ambulem, etiam si aliam ob causam ambulem, fieri natura tamen ut colorer; sic cum istos libros studiosius legerim, sentio Orationem meam illorum cantu quasi colorari. *Cic. de Oratore*, l. 2.

† I am strangely surpriz'd at His Lordship's Conduct—in writing for it; and that with Eagerness and very Unchristian and Uncharitable Reflections &c. *Prim. Christian*. Vol. 4. p. 241, 2.

the

the Command and Example of the Blessed JESUS, *Prays for those that Despitefully use him?* But I believe upon a Little Examination this will appear to be the very Reverse of the Case.

AS to the *Hard Words* you charge me with, if they are so *General* as you pretend (by which I suppose you mean Frequent) you might easily have mentioned some of them: but since you have not thought fit to do so, I must content my self with Observing to you, that you wrong your self very much in calling these *Hard Words* mine, whatever they are; since most of the Abusive Words our Language affords are certainly yours, as far as Constant Use and Undisputed Possession can give you a Right to them.

WHILST you do not scruple to charge the Church of which you call your self a Member, and at the same time almost all the *Christian Churches* (if that be not a Name too Good for them in their present *Degenerate State**) with *Popery*, and *Antichristianism* or *Opposition to Christ*; with imposing *Metaphysical Jargon*, and *Random Philosophy*, for Articles of Faith; with polluting GOD's *Sacred Worship* Grossly and shamefully, and maintaining such *Strange* and *Pernicious Errours*, as dishonour the Gospel of CHRIST,

* Essay on the Constitutions. p. 63.

and are sufficient to dispose Men to reject the Duties, on account of the Absurdity of the Doctrines, of Christianity; with holding Opinions fatally brought into the Church by Pagan Philosophy and Antichristian Tyranny, and derived from the Cerinthian, Basilidian, Theodosian, Valentini-an, and other Ancient Hereticks, and those too so monstrously Ridiculous that none of the Wildest Hereticks of old ever came to such an Height of Absurdity and Contradiction; and with retaining Antichristian Corruptions, introduced and supported by the Devil, and his Instruments*: Whilst you with singular Modesty, and in the Spirit of Meekness, can solemnly accuse Athanasius, Basil, Hilary, Jerom, Rufinus, Chrysostom, Socrates, Gelasius Cyzicenus, and a Vast Number of the Orthodox besides, both Antient and Modern, of Antichristian Frauds, and most wicked Practices†: Whilst all this cannot satisfy you, but the Whole Christian World must be Compendiously abused at once in the Persons of their Representatives assembled in General Councils; which in great Humility of Mind, and with no Less Decency of Expression, you are pleased to call the

* Histor. Pref. p. 8. 27. 28. 69. 85. Primit. Christian. Rev. vol. 1v. p. 50. 51. 176. 200. 242. 315. 321. 391. Append. p. 15. 18. 19.

† Essay on the Constitutions. p. 675, 6.

Grand Engine of the Devil for the Destruction of the Purity of the Christian Faith and Practice *: Whilst the Great Dignity of the Episcopal Order, which your *Constitutions* carry so very high, cannot restrain you from treating a very Eminent Bishop of your own Church and Nation very Disrespectfully, and sometimes with a very Indecent Air of Neglect and Contempt; nor yet from representing him as Guilty of *translating Origen unfairly to serve his own Purpose*, of *Miserably imposing on his Readers*, of *Partiality and Prevarication*, and *Unchristian Reflections* †: Whilst notwithstanding the Great Seriousness you profess; notwithstanding that Holy Awe and Reverence, which the Dignity, the Importance, the Mysteriousness of your Subject demanded from you; notwithstanding the Horrible Apprehensions of the Danger of Mistaking, which one would think should lie very heavy upon a Man's Spirits at the time when he was actually endeavouring to pull down the SON OF GOD from the Throne of His FATHER, and make a Creature of Him by whom all things were Created; notwithstanding the fear and *trembling*, which can seize you up-

* Prim. Christian. Rev. Vol. iv. Append. p. 20.

† Prim. Christian. Rev. Vol. iv. p. 132. 134. 135. 153. 154. 188. 189. 237. 242. Append. p. 44.

on Occasion, in pure Commiseration of the Dangerous Case of *Bp. Bull and the Christian Churches* †; You can yet be so little Concerned for your self; so little *Suspicious* of any Possibility, that the Catholick Church for so many Ages should have rightly understood the first Fundamental Article of Faith, and the True Object of Divine Worship, and you should have misunderstood it, and so little Apprehensive of the Dismal Consequences, which you have made your self Obnoxious to, if this should prove to be the Case; that you can indulge your self in so Unseasonable a Fit of Profane Mirth and *Jesting which is not Convenient*, as to Scoff at the Word TRINITY, and ridicule *that Blessed Name*, by which you your self own that your Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier may not improperly be called ¶: Whilst almost every Page in your Writings Present us with *Aburdities, Contradictions, Ignorance, Superstition, Jargon, Impious and Antichristian Frauds, Insincerity, Gross Imposition, Heretick, Knave, Unlearned, Ignoramus, Diabolical Miracles, Infamous Cheats, Wicked Forgeries, Prevarication, Unchristi-*

† Essay on the Constitut. p. 63. Prim. Christian. Vol. iv. p. 134. 135. 242.

¶ Little did the Bishop of Antioch think what a Famous, Solemn, Sacred Word he had pronounc'd, when he named the Word Trinity. Vol. iv. p. 389.

an Reflections, Villainy, Popery, the Devil, the Engines of the Devil, the Devil and his Instruments, &c. †: I have been content to borrow sometimes, and retort upon you, some of the softest of your *Hard Words*, such as, *Ignorance, Rashness, Assurance, &c.* And this being the Case, I was, I confess, at first a little surprized, to find my self Accused of using *Hard Words and Despightful Language* by the Author of *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*. It was some surprize to me, I say, and had been much more so, had I not been in some degree prepared for any thing of this Nature from a Writer, who in the very Place where he was Professedly blackening *Athanasius's Character*, and that in the *Hardest* and most Scurrilous *Words*, could make it an Article against Him, that He *treated His Adversaries with Unchristian Names of Reproach and Scorn*.

IF this be not enough to satisfy you, with how ill a Grace this Charge of *Hard Words* comes from you, and with how little Justice it is fixed upon me; I shall only beg the Favour of you to compare two Parallel Places in your *Suspensions* and my *Answer*, in order to your Compleat Satis-

† Hist. Pref. p. 8. 27. 28. 69. Essay on the Const. p. 63. 489. 514. 548. 676. 681. Prim. Christian. Vol. IV. p. 50. 51. 127. 147. 176. 200. 242. 315. 321. 373. 391. Append. p. 15. 18. 19. 20. 44. Append. to V. Vol. p. 22. 36.

faction in this Point. In the Close of your Fourteenth *Suspicion* you express your self thus, *We hence learn either that Athanasius was plainly forc'd to Prevaricate and Forge, or that He was an Ignoramus*; and in the Beginning of your Next, *But that all this cannot be charg'd on His Ignorance, but is in part deriv'd from His Knavery, is Evident, &c.* This Argument of yours I borrowed in answer to part of your Last *Suspicion*, and proposed it in the Following Words. "Till "Mr. *W.* shall be pleased to tell us which "these are, I shall only answer him with "one of his own Dilemma's: If this be "True, it is something to his Purpose, and "he is an Unwise Man for not Proving it, "instead of urging so many Trifling Ob- "jections; If it be False, he comes under a "worse Denomination, which I leave him "to find amongst the Titles he has bestowed upon *Athanasius*. Here, where I turned your own Darling *Dilemma* upon you, if I had loved *Hard Words*, might I not fairly have turned your own Words upon you too? And if I had done so, even in that Case, it would not, I think, have been a very Modest Complaint, that you had not more Respect paid you, than you thought was due from a Modern Presbyter to an Antient Patriarch, who while He lived was in Station and Dignity the Second Bishop
in

in the Christian World, and for His Eminent Piety was Canonized after His Death by the Unanimous Consent of the Catholick Church. But it seems to call *Athanasius*, an *Ambitious, Unlearned Knave, an Ignorant Heretick*, and a *Forerunner of Antichrist*, to accuse Him of *Prevarication* and *Notorious Forgeries*, of *Villainy* and *Murder*, is Innocent and *Primitive*: To Animadvert upon the Baseness and Scurrility, the Uncharitableness and Injustice, of such Language and such Imputations, is *Despightful, Unchristian*, and, in one Word, *Athanasian*.

SO much for *General Hard Words*: and if I have made any *Particular Personal Reflections* upon you, which are *Rash and False Insinuations*; I am ready, upon Conviction, to make you Reparation as Publick as the Injury. And to satisfy you that I am so disposed, I do here freely confess, though you have said nothing in your *Letter* to extort this Confession from me, or Convince me of my Error, that I was mistaken when I *Insinuated that you expect the Millennium about four Years hence*, though I cannot think I did you any Great Wrong by that *Insinuation*; for though you do not *expect the Millennium* then, yet it is most certain, that you *expect* things very nigh as Strange and Improbable. You *expect* then the End of the Pope's Tyranny, and the Per-

secution of the Church, particularly of *the Poor Vaudois*, who are then to *ascend into Heaven in the sight of their Enemies*¹. You expect that at this *Grand Period* the *Sanctuary shall be cleansed*², the *Athanasian Creed* abolished³, and the *Kingdom of the Franks* destroyed⁴; and that there shall also be a *Great Earthquake*, in which 7000 Men are to be slain, and that soon after the *Angel* is to sound the *Great Trumpet* for the *Restoration of the Jews*⁵. You expect then the *Period of the Antichristian State*, and the *Commencement of Christ's Kingdom*⁶; which words, as they are often repeated in your *Essay*, so they might very easily be understood of the *Millennium* by a Man more deeply studied in the *Revelation* than I pretend to be, supposing him not acquainted with the *Nice Distinction* between the *End of the Reign* and of the *Life of the Beast*; or between the *first and second Fall of Babylon*, which, you say, has not been enough considered or regarded by any⁷.

YOU see how Ingenuously I have dealt with you and the World in this matter: If you had thought fit to have done so too, you would not have accused me of

(1) *Essay on the Revelation*, p. 270. 1. (2) *Ibid.* p. 270.
 (3) *Primit. Christian. Rev.* Vol. 4. *Append.* p. 19. (4) *Essay on the Revelation*, p. 235. (5) *Ibid.* p. 271. (6) *Ibid.* p. 32. 201. &c. (7) . *Ib.* p. 88.

rashly and falsely Insinuating that you have Contradicted your self in several Points. Have I not plainly proved it upon you, as well as charged you with it? Have I not refer'd the Reader to the very Pages in your Books, where those *Contradictions* stand ready to stare him in the Face? Have I not proved, that you have *Contradicted your self about the Duration of the Millennium*, and multiplied what you formerly thought a Thousand Years¹ into Three Hundred and Sixty Five Thousand²? Have you not altered your Opinion about the *Genuineness of the Arabick MSS. at Oxford*, and have you not confessed it too in the very Page where you complain of me for *falsely Insinuating that you have Contradicted your self*? Have you not said, that the *Spurious Copies of Ignatius's Epistles were very Probably made by Athanasius, or one employed by Him about or after the middle of the fourth Century* in the very same Book in which you say, *it is highly Probable that neither Athanasius Himself nor any others of the Orthodox in the fourth Century ever saw them*³? Have you not declared more than once, that you was *exceedingly pleased*

(1) Essay on the Revelat. p. 17. (2) Essay on the Restoration of the Jews, p. 232. (3) First Essay on Ignatius's Epistles, p. 7. 40. 42.

to find Novatian agree with you almost in every thing'? And have you not since *dropt him and left him to the Possession of the Athanasians*, by refusing to maintain your Opinion, and Contenting your self with this Evasion, That if he be Orthodox, you *have done the Church a piece of Service by the Publication*? And here, upon your saying, that *all these Matters signify nothing to the points in Question*, if I had any Inclination to recriminate, I might, I think, with less Injustice accuse you of *falsely Insinuating*, that *these Matters* were brought in purely to expose you; when it is so very plain, that they were proposed as Arguments *ad hominem* in the Particular Case of *Dionysius's Epistle*.

I COME now to the Last *Insinuation* you charge me with, which is, *that you have Attempted to Injure your Successors by cutting down Timber Unfairly upon the Lands of your Professorship*. That *Posterity* will be more concerned in your Quarrel with Mr. *Lucas's Timber*, than with *Athanasius*, I have affirmed; that you had any Unjust Design in making that *Wast*, I neither affirmed, nor *Insinuated*, nor Believed. Ever since I have been

(1) *Histor. Pref.* p. 12. and *Pref. to Sermons and Essays*.
 (2) *First Reply to Dr. Allix*, p. 16, 17.

Capable of making any Observations upon the Springs and Motives of Human Acts, it has been an Established Notion with me, that amongst the Many Acts of Injustice done every day, very few are done by Men who believe and know them to be so. In this Principle I have not been at all Staggered by the Ill-natured Maxims, which some, who would be thought best to Understand Human Nature, have fixed upon all Mankind, because they found them in their own Selfish Dispositions: but I have been very much Confirmed in it from its Agreeableness and Conformity to the most Excellent of Christian Graces, that *Charity* which *believeth all things, hopeth all things, and thinketh no Evil*. Upon this Principle I generally fancy my self able to account for many *Suspicious* Actions, without bringing the Sincerity of the Actors into Question. Upon this Principle, I can easily charge the Numerous Misrepresentations, &c. which I meet with in your Writings, upon the Acknowledged *Warmth of your Temper*, and the *Eagerness with which you have entered into your Arian Scheme*. Upon this Principle I can separate the Fact from the Intention in the present Case, and believe it Unlawful for you to *cut down Timber* without the Knowledge of the Trustees, at the same time as I readily

allow and believe, that you would not have done it, if you had thought it Unlawful. And as for *Insinuating* the Unlawfulness of the Fact, you know very well that it is a very Common Opinion; and therefore, instead of *Expostulating* with me, I think you might with more reason have thanked me for giving you so fair an Opportunity of doing your self Justice, that *Arianism* might have its full Course, and not suffer in its Progress for any *False Imputation* upon its *Reviver*. But, say you, what *Signifies* my *Cutting down Timber to the Points in Question*? Not very much truly: Just as much as the Passage in your *Suspensions*, which gave me Occasion to mention it, I mean the Concern you express for the Character of an *Arian* with Posterity, which you very Ingeniously pretend to fear that some body or other should *hereafter* rob you of by *some Witty Reconciliation*; which Needless Apprehension led me so far out of my way, after your Example, as to observe to you, for your Ease and Quiet in that matter, that your *Suspensions* did not seem strong enough to be Longlived, and that Future Ages would in all Probability be more concerned in your *Cutting down Mr. Lucas's Oaks*, than your *Knocking down Athanasius*.

AND

AND now, Sir, I am come to your Last Charge against *Athanasius*, where we are to expect a *Certain Account of His Dishonesty*. And here it seems instead of *Conjectural Suspicions*, *Conviction* now is the Word: Instead of *some Reasons for that Bad Opinion you had entertained as to the Sincerity of Athanasius*, nothing less is now pretended than *Undoubted Proof*; and that too very Formidably set out with all the Mathematical Pomp of *Three Propositions*, *Seventeen Demonstrations* and a half, and *Six Corollaries*. As my Adversaries are here encreased upon me, by the Accession of *Two Other Learned and Judicious Persons*, I think I might refuse your Challenge honourably enough, upon the account of such Great Odds, and remind you that I undertook to Vindicate *Athanasius* no farther than as He was attackt by your *Suspicions*, and Consequently that if I have made good my Answers to them, I have gained my point: But since you have represented my Zeal for *Athanasius's* Reputation to be so Great, that if I think I can answer you by Half so Good Arguments, it is not to be doubted but the Publick will hear again from me; I chuse to run the hazard of being thought too Officious in the Defense of the Truth, rather than It should be evil spoken of by any upon the Occasion of my Silence.

THE

THE *Propositions* you undertake to *Demonstrate* are these *Three*.

I. *THAT Athanasius does several times Directly affirm, that the Council of Nice did, even in their Solemn Anathema's, condemn the Arians for saying that our Saviour was Created; And That He put abroad Copies of those Anathema's, with the Insertion of that Clause, as Condemned by them.*

II. *THAT yet 'tis Certain this Council did not Insert the Word Created into those Anathema's; but rather, by omitting it, did directly avoid its Condemnation.*

III. *THAT Therefore Athanasius was Guilty of a Known and Wilful Falsity and Interpolation, in this Important Matter; and of Voluntarily Propagating a Notorious Forgery over the Christian World.*

I. AS to your *First Proposition*, if I apprehended any danger to *Athanasius* from it, many things might be said to Invalidate it: but as I am under no such Apprehensions, I shall only Observe to you by the way,

i. *THAT the oftener Athanasius directly affirms that the Council of Nice did condemn the word Created, the more Improbable it is that He foisted that Clause into the Anathemas. It may possibly be Consistent*

sistent enough with the Opinion you have of His *Boldness*, but it is utterly irreconcilable with the Justice His *Parts* and Sense have extorted from you, to suppose Him capable of frequently quoting a Clause He had forged Himself, and arguing from it, in His Writings against *the Arians*, at a time when there were so many True Copies extant, and so many Adversaries ready to make their Advantage of it; when the Discovery would be so very Easy, and so Fatal to His Reputation and His Cause. This would have been holding out a Light to His Enemies to shew them His own Villainy, which otherwise, amongst the Multitude of Copies, might possibly have escaped unobserved, till Time had made the Detection more Difficult.

2. YOU have not *Demonstrated*, I think, that *Athanasius* put abroad Copies of those *Anathemas* with the Insertion of that Clause. As for *Eusebius's* Letter, Dr. Cave is of Opinion that it was not subjoined to the Book *De Decretis* by *Athanasius*: And granting that *Athanasius* did really send a Copy of *Eusebius's* Letter with His own Epistle *De Decretis*, for the Use and Satisfaction of His Friend; yet since that Letter is a distinct Work of a Different Author, it is not altogether Improbable, that it might be omitted as such by the First Transcribers, and afterwards annexed,
from

from *Socrates*, *Gelasius*, or some other Copy, in those two MSS in which only we find it, upon the account of the Real or Apparent Reference made to it in the Book *De Decretis*.

BESIDES, if the Clause, ἡ κτιζὸν, be not Genuin, why might it not creep into that Copy of *Eusebius's Letter*, and into the Epistle to *Jovian*, as well as the word κτίσμα into the *Synodical Epistle* of the Council of *Nice*, which *Athanasius* has nowhere given us a Copy of, that I remember? Why not as well as ἀνάρχως and αἰδώς into the Copy of the Creed in two MSS of *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν into one of the Copies in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and μονογενῇ θεόν into one of *Socrates's Copies*? In *Theodorit's Copy* of *Athanasius's Epistle to Jovian* several things are added, which are not in *Athanasius's* own Copy; and why might not this Clause be added so too? If ἡ κτιζὸν be really Spurious, as You pretend to have *Demonstrated*, since *Athanasius* could not have any End to serve by Forging it (as He certainly could not) what hinders it from being Charged upon the *Librarians* here, as well as in other Innumerable Instances of the same nature? Why might it not as well get into the few MSS we have of these Epistles, as a Thousand other Spurious words into five times as many MSS of all Sorts
of

of Books, Sacred, Ecclesiastical, and Profane?

I WOULD also gladly be Informed upon what Grounds you are so very Positive, that *these words are found in all* those very Few MSS. They are all on the other side of the Water, and therefore I presume you will not pretend to have *found* this Clause in them your self: The Editors say nothing of the matter; and whether their Silence will justify your Bold Assertion, I leave you to consider at your Leisure. Your Acquaintance with MSS, I am very well satisfied, is but small, and by no means sufficient to bear you out in making so Free with them, as you do here, and in several other Places.

II. I PROCEED now to your *Second Proposition*, which is to be *Demonstrated by going over all the several Numerous Copies of the Anathema's, that have been Observed during the Fourth and Fifth Centuries.* And here, Sir, before I begin to examine these *several Numerous Witnesses*, I must *Observe* to you, as a very great Defect in your Scheme, that you have not brought any Proof at all, though you ought to have put it beyond all doubt, that those Writers, who have *this Clause, Transcribed* it from *Athanasius*. Two such there are at least, *Socrates* and *Gelasius Cyzicenus*:
both

both these, you say, *copied from Athanasius*, and that *because they could have the Clause from no other Copy*. But this Pleasant Argument manifestly begs the Main Question, proceeding and depending entirely upon the Supposition that this Clause is not Genuine, and was therefore not to be found in any Books or Archives, any Record or other Copy of those *Anathemas* then extant: That is to say, you will *Demonstrate*, that *they could have it from no other Copy but that of Athanasius*, provided it be Granted you, that it was *Forged by Athanasius*, and to be found nowhere else. And this, it seems, is to pass for *Mathematical Demonstration, Full Evidence, and Legal Conviction*.

WITH respect to *Socrates* indeed you offer at another Reason, or rather a Piece of a Reason: *We have*, you say, *Almost Another Testimony that Socrates took this Clause from Athanasius; since Rufinus, from whom otherwise he must most Probably have taken it, has no sign of it in his Copy*. This I have already answered at large, p. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. whither I refer you; Observing only, that this Argument, as well as the former, proceeds and depends upon the Supposition of the Main Point in Debate. You take it for Granted, that the Clause was Spurious, and no where extant in any Authentic Copy; otherwise what need is
there

there of Concluding, that he *must Probably take it from Athanasius*, because *Rufinus* has it not? A Mathematician may do Great things by the help of a Small *Postulat*: but certainly this is a very Poor Cause of yours, which cannot be Maintained without Begging the Question thus Continually.

ONE thing more seems Convenient to be done before I enter upon the Examination of your *Witnesses*, and that is to set down a Copy of *the Nicene Creed and Anathemas* in Greek and Latin, with such Various Readings as you have given me occasion to Observe. The Greek Copy I shall chuse for this Purpose, in Deference to your Judgment, shall be that which *Eusebius* gives us in his Letter, as it is inserted by *Theodorit* into his History; for that being, in your Opinion, a True Copy of *Eusebius's* Letter, must consequently in your Opinion contain a True Copy of *the Nicene Creed*. I shall also at the same time give the Collation of the two Copies in *Epiphanius*, *the Exposition of the Creed* in *Athanasius*, and *Sozomen's Exact Account of the Anathemas*; that every Reader may be able to Judge for himself of the Truth of what I shall have occasion to say, when I come to consider them in their Order.

ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΕΝ εἰς ἓνα θεὸν πατέρα παντο-
 κράτορα, πάντων 1 ὁρατῶν τε 2 καὶ ἀοράτων 3 ποιη-
 τῶν 4· καὶ εἰς 5 ἓνα κύριον 6 ἰησοῦν χριστὸν, τὸ υἱὸν
 7 θεοῦ 7 γεννηθέντα ἐκ 8 πατρὸς 8 μονογενῆ 9,
 τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς πατρὸς 10, θεὸν ἐκ
 θεοῦ 11, καὶ 12 φῶς ἐκ φωτός, θεὸν 13 ἐκ θεοῦ
 ἀληθινῶς, γεννηθέντα ὅτι ποιηθέντα, ὁμοῦσι τῷ
 πατρὶ 14, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο 15, τὰ τε
 16 ἐν τῷ 17 ἔρανος 18 καὶ 19 τὰ 20 ἐν τῇ
 γῇ 21, τὸ δι' ἡμᾶς τὰς ἀνθρώπους 22 καὶ διὰ 23
 τῶν ἡμετέρων σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα 24, καὶ 25

(1) Omit πάντων Basf. 1. Alex. Carth. 1. 2. Gelaf. (2) om.
 τὸ Niceph. Socr. 2. inf. πάντων Gelaf. Basf. 1. (3) read
 ἀοράτων τὸ ἐ ὁρατῶν Epiph. 2. (4) r. ποιητῶν ἔρανος τὸ καὶ
 γῆς ὁρατῶν τὸ πάντων ἐ ἀοράτων. Epiph. 1. (5) inf. τὸν
 Athan. in some MSS. (6) inf. ἡμῶν Basf. 1. 2. Car. 1. r. ἓνα
 μονογενῆ θεὸν Soc. 2. (7) inf. τὸ μονογενῆ Epiph. 1. Eph. 1.
 Cyr. A. 2. r. τὸ γνηθῆντα Epiph. 3. Car. 1. 2. Chal. 4. (8) om.
 τῆς Euf. 4. (9) r. τὸν μονογενῆ Eph. 4. Cyr. A. 3. om. μονο-
 γενῆ Eph. 1. Cyr. 2. Exp. Soc. 2. r. τὸ ἐκ 8 πατρὸς γνηθῆντα
 ὡς πάντων τὸ αἰῶνας. Epiph. 1. (10) inf. ἀνάρχως Cyr. H.
 for πατρὸς r. αὐτῆς Eph. 4. Cyr. A. 3. (11) om. θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ
 Basf. 1. Epiph. 1. (12) om. καὶ Euf. 2. 3. 4. Cyr. H. Basf. 1. 2.
 Car. 1. 2. Theod. Soc. 1. 2. Eph. 1. 3. 4. Cyr. A. 1. 2. 3. Ch.
 1. 3. 4. Gel. Alex. Ath. Epiph. 1. 2. 3. Exp. Nicēph. (13) inf.
 ἀληθινὸν Euseb. 2. 3. 4. Basf. 1. 2. Cyr. H. Car. 1. 2. Soc. 1. 2.
 Eph. 1. 3. 4. Cyr. A. 1. 2. 3. Ch. 1. 3. 4. Gel. Ath. Nic. Theod.
 Epiph. 1. 2. 3. Alex. Exp. (14) inf. αἰδίως Cyr. H. (15) r.
 δι' οὗ ἐποίησε τὰς αἰῶνας Eph. 1. in the Margin. Cyr. A. 2. in
 the Margin. (16) om. τὸ Gel. (17) om. τῷ Euf. 4.
 Car. 1. 2. Epiph. 3. (18) r. τοῖς ἔρανοῖς Epiph. 1. 2. (19)
 for καὶ read τὰ π Euf. 4. Car. 1. (20) om. τὰ Basf. 2.
 (21) om. τὰ π ἐν τῇ ἔρανος ἐ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. Alex. r. ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ
 Ath. Epiph. 3. Soc. 2. Theod. Exp. inf. ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων
 Exp. Epiph. 2. (22) om. τὰς ἀνθρώπους Alex. (23) om.
 διὰ Alex. (24) inf. ἐκ τῶν ἔρανων Basf. 1. 2. Ch. 4. Epiph. 1.
 (25) om. καὶ Cyr. H. Basf. 1. Alex. Ch. 1. Theod. Exp.

ΤΟΥΣ ἵ λέγοντας ὅτι 40 ἦν ποτὲ 41 ὅτε 42 ἐκ ἧν
43, καὶ 44 πρὶν 45 γεννηθῆναι ὅτι καὶ 46, καὶ 47

(38) inf. αὐτῷ Gel. (39) r. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Euf. 3. Ch. 3. 4. Ath. Alex. Eph. 1. 4. Cyr. A. 2. 3. Nic. Epiph. 1. Exp. r. τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον Car. 1. inf. τὸ κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν Ch. 4. inf. κύριον καὶ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συναρροσυνόμενον καὶ συνδιεξήμενον, τὸ λαλήσαν διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων εἰς μίαν ἀγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν. ὁμολογούμεν ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἀφῆσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἀμὴν. Epiph. 1. inf. τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν νόμῳ. Ἐκ ηὐξάνει ἐν ταῖς ἀποστολαῖς, καὶ καταβάν ἐπὶ τῇ Ἰορδάνῃ, λαλοῦν ἐν ἀποστόλοις, οἵκον ἐν ἀγίοις· ἔτις δὲ πιστεύουσιν αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἐπὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ, πνεῦμα τέλειον, πνεῦμα παράκλητον, ἀκρῶς, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβανόμενον καὶ πιστεύμενον. πιστεύμεν εἰς μίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανοίας, καὶ εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, Ἐκ κρείσιν δικαίαν ψυχῶν Ἐ σωμάτων, καὶ εἰς βασιλείαν ὑφαντῶν, καὶ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Epiph. 2. inf. τὸ ὅτι ἀλλότριον πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ ὅν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, τὸ ἀκρῶς, τὸ τέλειον, τὸ παράκλητον, τὸ λαλήσαν ἐν νόμῳ Ἐ ἐν ἀποστολαῖς Ἐ ἐν εὐαγγελίοις· καταβάν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰορδάνην, ηὐξάνει ἀποστόλοις, οἵκον ἐν ἀγίοις· καὶ πιστεύμεν εἰς μίαν μόνην ταύτην καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἐν βάπτισμα μετανοίας καὶ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, εἰς κρείσιν αἰώνιον ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Exp.

(40) Om. ὅτι Euf. 2. 3. 4. Alex. Ath. Cyr. H. Baf. 1. 2. Gel. Car. 1. 2. Soc. 2. Ch. 1. 3. 4. Eph. 1. 3. Cyr. A. 1. 2. Nic. Soz. Epiph. 1. 3. (41) om. ποτὲ Car. 1. for ποτὲ r. καὶ ποτὲ Car. 2. Alex. (42) om. ὅτε Soc. 2. (43) inf. ὁ υἱός ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον Epiph. 2. inf. ὁ υἱός, ἢ ἡν ποτὲ ὅτε ἐκ ἧν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα Exp. (44) for καὶ read ἢ Euf. 3. Nic. Cyr. A. 1. (45) for πρὶν r. ὡς ἔστι. Car. 1. (46) om. καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ὅτι ἦν. Car. 2. Alex. Epiph. 2. Exp. and the Old Translation of Eph. 1. ap. Lup. for πρὶν γεννηθῆναι ὅτι ἦν r. ὅτι ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι Euf. 3. Nic. Cyr. A. 1. (47) for καὶ r. ἢ Exp. Epiph. 1. 3.

ὅτι 48 ἐξ οὗκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἐτέ-
ρας 49 ὑποστάσεως ἢ 50 ὁσίας 51 φάσκον-
τας 52 εἶναι 53 πρεπτόν 54 ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν 55 τὸν
ᾧ θεῷ 56 ἀναθηματίζῃ 57 ἡ ἀγία 58 καθολικὴ 59
καὶ ἀποστολικὴ 60 ἐκκλησία 61.

CREDIMUS in unum Deum Patrem
Omnipotentem, omnium 1 visibilibum &
invisibilibum factorem 2. Et in 3 unum

(48) for καὶ ὅτι 1. ἢ Euf. 3. Nic. Cyr. A. 1. (49)
inf. πρὸς Eph. 1. Cyr. A. 2. for ἐτέρας 1. ἄλλης Car.
1. (50) om. ὑποστάσεως ἢ Car. 1. (51) om. ἢ
ὁσίας Cyr. H. (52) for φάσκοντας 1. λέγοντας Car. 1. om.
φάσκοντας Alex. Car. 2. Soz. (53) om. εἶναι Car. 1. 2. Soz.
Alex. after εἶναι inf. καὶ Eph. 1. Cyr. A. 2. inf. ἢ Cyr. H. Car.
2. Soc. 2. Bas. 1. 2. Alex. Gel. Eph. 3. 4. Cyr. A. 3. Soz.
Epiph. 3. Ch. 1. inf. ἢ κηρὸν ἢ Euf. 2. 3. 4. Athan. Theod. Socr.
1. Niceph. Cyr. A. 1. 1. φάσκοντας εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ τὸ
πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, πρεπτόν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν Exp. (54) 1. εἶναι
ῥευστόν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν Epiph. 1. (55) 1. ἀλλοιωτὸν ἢ πρεπτόν
Car. 1. (56) om. τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ Soz. inf. ἢ τὸ ἅγιον
πνεῦμα Epiph. 2. 1. τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸν Epiph. 1. inf. τούτους. Theod.
Euf. 3. Ath. Cyr. H. Bas. 1. Car. 1. Soc. 2. Exp. Ch. 1. 3. 4.
Eph. 1. 3. 4. Cyr. A. 2. 3. Epiph. 1. 2. 3. Nic. inf. τὰς ποιήτας
Bas. 2. Gel. Car. 2. Alex. Cyr. A. 1. (57) ἀπεκήρυξαν ἐκ τῆς
καθόλου ἐκκλησίας ἀποτρέψας ἐψέφισαντο Soz. 1. ἀναθηματίζομεν ὅτι
αὐτὰς ἀναθηματίζει. Exp. (58) om. ἀγία Exp. Euf. 2. 3. 4.
Gel. Cyr. H. Alex. Bas. 1. 2. Soc. 2. Car. 1. 2. Eph. 1. 3. 4. Cyr.
A. 1. 2. 3. Ch. 3. 4. Epiph. 1. 2. 3. Nic. inf. τοῦ θεοῦ Eph. 3.
(59) inf. μήτηρ ἡμῶν Exp. (60) om. ἀποστολικὴ Euf. 2. 1.
ἀποστολικὴ ἐ καθολικὴ Euf. 4. Eph. 4. Cyr. A. 3. Ch. 1. 3.
(61) add τοῦ θεοῦ Soc. 2. add ἡ μήτηρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ πα-
λιν ἀναθηματίζομεν τὰς μὴ ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνάσσειν νεκρῶν, ἐ πα-
σας αἰρέσεις καὶ μὴ ἐκ ταύτης τὴ ὀρθῆς πίστεως ἔσας. Epiph. 26
add καὶ ἀναθηματίζομεν πάντας τὰς μὴ ὁμολογοῦντας ἀνάσσειν
σαρκός, καὶ παῖσαι αἰρέσεις, ἐκτίει τὰς μὴ ὄντας ἐκ ταύτης τὴ πίστεως
τὴ ἀγίας ἐ μόνης καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Exp.

1 om. omnium Luc.

2 Conditorem Car. 3. inf. coeli & terrae Eph. 2.

3 om. in Naz.

132 *An Answer to the Charge of*

Dominum nostrum 4 Jesum Christum Fili-
um Dei 5, natum ex 6 Patre 7 Unigeni-
tum 8 hoc 9 est de substantia Patris,
Deum ex 10 Deo, lumen ex 11 lumine 12,
Deum verum de 13 Deo vero, natum non
factum, unius substantiae cum Patre, quod
Graece 14 dicunt ὁμοῖον 15, per quem
omnia facta sunt 16 quae in coelo 17
& 18 in terra 19, qui propter 20 nostram
salutem descendit de coelis 21 & incar-
natus est 22, & 23 homo factus est 24, & 25

-
- 4 om. *nostrum* Hil. 2. Eph. 2. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.
5 inf. *unigenitum* Hil. 2. Eph. 2.
6 r. *de* Hil. 2. Naz. Ruf. Luc. Car. 3.
7 r. *de Patre natum* Ruf.
8 om. *unigenitum* Eph. 2. Hil. 2. Luc. r. *Unicum* Naz. inf.
ante omnia saecula Eph. 2.
9 *hoc* Naz. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.
10 r. *de* Hil. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.
11 r. *de* Hil. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.
12 om. *Deum ex Deo, Lumen ex Lumine* Eph. 2.
13 *ex* Ruf.
14 *Graeci* Hil. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3.
15 r. ὁμοῖον *Patri hoc est ejusdem cum Patre substantiae*
Ruf. r. *consubstantialem Patri* Ch. 2. Eph. 2.
16 inf. *sive* Hil. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3. inf. *et* Ch. 2.
17 *coelis* Ruf. Car. 3.
18 for & r. *sive quae* Hil. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3. inf. *quae*
Ruf. Ch. 2.
19 inf. *sunt.* Luc. r. *terris* Car. 3. om. *quae in coelo &*
in terra Eph. 2.
20 inf. *nos & propter* Ruf. inf. *nos homines & propter* Hil. 2.
Naz. Eph. 2. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.
21 om. *de coelis* Hil. 2. Naz. Ruf. Luc. Ch. 2. Eph. 2. Car. 3.
22 inf. *de Spiritu Sancto* Car. 3. inf. *de Spiritu Sancto &*
Maria Virgine Eph. 2.
23 om. & Hil. 2. Ruf. Luc.
24 om. *est.* Ruf. Car. 3. for *homo factus est* r. *inhumana-*
tus est. Ch. 2. r. *humanatus est* Eph. 2.
25 om. & Hil. 2. Naz. Ruf. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.

passus

passus est, & 26 resurrexit tertia die, &
27 ascendit in 28 coelos 29, venturus 30
judicare vivos & mortuos 31. Et in 32
Spiritus Sanctum.

EOS autem qui dicunt erat 33 quan-
do non erat, & antequam 34 nasceretur
non erat, & quod 35 de 36 non 37 ex-
stantibus 38 factus est 39 vel 40 ex 41
alia 42 substantia 43 aut 44 essentia 45
dicentes 46 esse 47 convertibilem & mutabi-

26 om. & Naz. Luc.

27 om. & Hil. 2. Eph. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.

28 r. ad Naz.

29 coelum Luc. inf. inde Naz. Ruf. Car. 3.

30 inf. inde Ch. 2.

31 inf. Credimus Luc.

32 om. in Naz.

33 r. dicentes autem erat Eph. 2. inf. aliquando Ruf. Ch. 2.

34 priusquam Hil. 2. Eph. 2. Naz. Luc. Car. 3.

35 quia Hil. 2. Car. 3. Ch. 2. Eph. 2. Luc. Ruf.

36 ex. Ruf. Hil. 2. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2.

37 nullis Hil. 2. Ruf. Luc. Car. 3.

38 substantibus Ruf. existentibus Car. 3. Ch. 2.

39 inf. quod Graeci hexuconton dicunt Hil. 2. r. & qui ex ni-
hilo factum Ambr.

40 aut Ruf. Amb.

41 om. ex Hil. 2.

42 altera Ch. 2.

43 subsistentia Ruf. Ch. 2. Eph. 2.

44 sive Hil. 2. vel Ruf. Car. 3. Ch. 2.

45 ouisia Amb. substantia Ruf. Eph. 2. Natura Car.

3. om. aut essentia Luc.

46 dicunt Ambr. Ruf.

47 om. esse Hil. 2. Luc. Car. 3. om. & quod de non ex-
stantibus factus est vel ex alia substantia aut essentia di-
centes esse Naz. inf. aut Amb. Ch. 2. Eph. 2.

lem 48 Deum 49, hos 50 anathematizat Catholica 51 Ecclesia. (*Hilar. de Syn. col. 358.*)

48 r. *mutabilem & convertibilem* Hil. 2. Amb. Luc. Car. 3. r. *ᾠπετόν* aut *convertibilem* vel *mutabilem* Ruf. r. *mutabilem* vel *convertibilem* Naz. r. *mutabilem* aut *convertibilem* Ch. 2. r. aut *convertibilem* vel *mutabilem* Eph. 2. inf. esse Naz.

49 r. *Filium Dei* Hil. 2. Naz. Ruf. Luc. Eph. 2. Car. 3. Ch. 2. r. *Dei Filium* Amb.

50 om. *hos* Amb. Ruf.

51 inf. & *Apostolica*. Hil. 2. Amb. Naz. Ruf. Luc. Car. 3. Ch. 2. Eph. 2.

The Abbreviations are as follows,

Alex. The Copy from Alexandria and Constantinople, ap. Bevereg. Pand. Tom. 1. p. 674. *Amb.* St. Ambrose's Copy of the Anathemas, L. 1. *de Fide* c. 18. col. 467. Ed. Ben. *Ath.* Athanasius's Copy in His Epistle to Jovian. *Bas.* 1. Basil, Tom. 3. Epist. 60. p. 90. *Bas.* 2. Ib. Ep. 78. p. 138. *Car.* 1. 2. 3. The Copies in the Acts of the Council of Carthage, ap. Labb. T. 2. p. 1050. 1146. 1593. *Ch.* 1. 2. 3. 4. The Copies in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, ap. Labb. T. 4. p. 133. 285. 339. 563. *Cyr. A.* 1. 2. 3. Copies in the Works of Cyrill of Alexandria, T. 5. p. 389. 90. T. 6. p. 69. 177. *Cyr. H.* The Copy in the two MSS. of Cyrill of Jerusalem. *Eph.* 1. 3. 4. Copies in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, ap. Labb. T. 3. p. 398. 672. 1183. *Eph.* 2. Another Copy in the same Acts, ap. Baluz. p. 458. cut off in the beginning with an &c. in Labb. p. 459. *Epiph.* 1. 2. 3. Epiphan. Ancor. p. 122. 3. 123. 4. Panar. H. 72. p. 843. 4. *Euf.* 2. The Copy in Eusebius's Epistle as it is given us by Athanasius. *Euf.* 3. The same in Socrates. *Euf.* 4. The same in Gelasius Cyzicenus. *Exp.* The Exposition of the Creed among the Works of Athanasius. Tom. 1. par. 2. p. 1278. 9. *Gel.* The Copy in Gelasius. *Hil.* 2. Hilar. Fragment. col. 415, 16. *Luc.* The Copy in Lucifer Calaritanus, De non parcendo in Deum Delinquentibus. *Naz.* The Copy in Gregory Nazianzen's Works p. 727. *Nic.* A Copy in Nicephorus's Ecclesiastical History l. viii. c. 17. p. 568. *Ruf.* Rufinus's Copy, H. E. L. 1. c. 6. p. 198. Ed. Parif. *Soc.* 1. 2. Socrates, l. 1. c. 8. p. 19. l. iv. c. 12. p. 181. *Soz.* Sozomen's Exact Account. l. 1. c. 21. p. 355. *Theod.* The Copy in Athanasius's Epistle to Jovian ap. Theodorit. E. H. l. iv. c. 3. p. 154.

THE Use of this Collection will soon appear: In the mean time I shall only desire you to consider the Largeness of it. I much question whether the most Diligent Searchers after Various Readings can find so many, within the same number of words, in all Antiquity. I do not say this with any Design to magnify my own Diligence in Collating these Copies, which might have been done as well by any Man who can read; much less with an Intention to cast a Reflection upon the Venerable Fathers of the Church, and other Ecclesiastical Writers, from the Marks of Negligence so Visible in the Copies they have given us of this Creed, most of which may much more reasonably be charged upon their Transcribers. All I would Observe from it is, that a Word so well attested as *κατὰ* is, even upon your own State of the Case, cannot be rejected as Spurious, *with any Assurance upon the Testimony of Witnesses*, who are so little agreed amongst themselves which Words are Genuin and which Spurious. But I proceed to your Proofs.

I. YOUR First *Witness* is *Eusebius*, in the True Copy of whose Letter to his Diocese these Words, You say, are entirely wanting. Of this Letter we have Four Copies; and those are in *Athanasius*, *Socrates*, *Theodorit*, and *Gelasius Cyzicenus*.

The Two first and the Last have this *Clause*, the Third has it not. But this Great Disparity in the Number is not the only Advantage you must allow us; for *Athanasius*, who was *Eusebius's* Contemporary, and *Gelasius*, who was his Successor in the See of *Caesarea*, must necessarily be much more likely to meet with a *True Copy* of his *Letter* than *Theodorit*. The nearer a Copy is taken from the Original, the Greater is the Probability of its Exactness. And as it could not pass through very many hands, before it came to *Athanasius*; so *Gelasius*, who had the Archives of that Church at his Command, could not well miss of the Original it self, or at least an *Authentick* Transcript from it. And as it is highly Probable in the Nature of the Thing, that *Athanasius* and *Gelasius* should give us a better Copy of *Eusebius's Letter* than *Theodorit*; so we find that the Fact corresponds exactly with the Probability, in the Difference betwixt their Copies of the *Nicene Creed in the body of that Letter*. For in the first place, *Theodorit* inserts the word & N^o. 12, which I find in no other Copy. And this little Monosyllable, as Harmless and Inconsiderable as it may perhaps appear to be at first sight, does not only manifestly interrupt the Course of the Period, but is also very Prejudicial to the Sense. 2. He omits the word

ἀληθινόν N°. 13, which is unanimously retained in all the other Copies I have seen, and without it the whole Clause is Impertinent, Improper, and Absurd. 3. In the Anathematisms N°. 53. he omits the Particle ἡ, which is not only *attested to* by the Majority of Copies, and therefore, according to your Way of Arguing, most certainly Genuin; but is also visibly requisite to fill up the Sentence. Lastly he inserts the word ἀγία N°. 58, which is rejected by almost all the other Copies. Notwithstanding all this, you undertake to prove, that *Theodorit's* only is the *True Copy*, and that by no less Arguments, than *Eusebius's own Testimony*, and the Impossibility of the Contrary.

EUSEBIUS himself, you say, in the body of that very Letter, goes over the several Disputable Points which he had signed, and gives the Sense in which, and the Reasons for which he signed every one of them respectively; but not a Syllable of this Condemnation of the Term Created. To a man who was not acquainted with your way of Writing, this Confidence in a False Assertion, so Easily disproved, would be amazing to the Last Degree. Was it not a Disputable Point, whether our Saviour was θεὸς ἀληθινός? Is not that an Article of the Creed which *Eusebius Signed*? And has he given us any wherein
that

that Letter the Reasons for which he Signed it? Was it not a Disputable Point, whether our Saviour might be called $\tau\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ or $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\omega\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$? Are not these Words condemned in the Anathemas? And has Eusebius given us any Reason why he Signed the Condemnation of either of them Respectively, or so much as mentioned either of them? No: but they are both comprehended in the $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\varsigma\ \delta\pi\iota\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$, and so is $\kappa\eta\tau\omicron\nu$ too, for any thing which appears, or can possibly appear, to the contrary. Eusebius therefore does not give the Sense in which, and the Reasons for which he Signed every one of the several Disputable Points Respectively; and consequently it is very Unlucky for you, that in your Great Haste and Eagerness to Convi \acute{c} t Athanasius of Forgery, you should be so soon Convicted your self of falsifying the Testimony of your own Witness, in the very beginning of the Tryal.

SO much for Eusebius's own Testimony: your other Argument is drawn from his Integrity, and thus expressed, Nor could he possibly have Signed the Condemnation of that, on his own Principles; which were to keep close to the Words of Scripture, under every Article; while all Christians, I think, did then own, that the Scripture did expressly say our Saviour
was

was Created. But if he was *obliged to sign this Creed much against his will*, as you venture to assure us*; If *Fear of Deprivation*, as you Charitably Doubt†, was one of his *Reasons* for Subscribing the Whole; why should his *Principles* hinder him from Subscribing so small a Part? Or how can you conclude, that the *Disputed Clause* was not in the *Anathemas*, because *Eusebius could not sign it on his own Principles*; whilst you suspect, that one of the *Principles*, on which he acted in that Affair, was the Principle of *Fear*? Besides, Was not *Eusebius* an *Arian*, in your Opinion; and did he not, by your Confession, *sign the Creed*? And could any *Arian* possibly do that *on his own Principles*? And must we conclude then that the Clause is Spurious, because *Eusebius could not sign it on his own Principles*, and believe that at the very same time he *Signed* several other things, which he could not possibly Sign on his own Principles?

BUT I am under no necessity of insisting upon the Weakness of this Consequence. *Eusebius*, you say, *could not*

* Prim. Christian. Vol. IV. p. 191.

† Ib. Append. p. 16.

*sign the Condemnation of the Term Created, on his own Principles; because all Christians; you think, did Then own, that the Scripture did expressly say our Saviour was Created. Whatever other Christians might own, I believe you will find it a very hard matter to prove that Eusebius owned any such thing: and certainly a man of his known Abilities and Integrity would not make other Mens Opinions the Principles of his Actions. I may take it for granted, I suppose, that you mean the Famous Text, Κύριος ἔκτισέ με, Proverb. viii. 22. This, I confess, was almost Universally understood to belong to our Saviour, in what Sense I am not at present concerned to Enquire; since Eusebius himself tells us *, that ἔκτισε is not the True Translation of the word קָנָה in the Original, and that all the Other Interpreters unanimously render it by ἐκτίσασα†, which Translation he there illustrates and approves of. And I can see no reason why he should refuse to Sign the Condemnation of the Term Created, upon the Account of its being applied to our Saviour in a False Translation of an Allegorical Part of Scripture.*

* De Ecclef. Theolog. l. iii. c. 2. p. 152, 3.

† Καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὅτι κειμένης τῆς Κἀνα λέξεως, τὸ ἐκτίσασα πάν-
της συμφώνως ἐκδιδώκασιν οἱ ἰρμηνευταί. Ib. p. 153.

BUT suppose we should make another Concession, and allow, that *Eusebius did own, that the Scripture did expressly say our Saviour was Created*; then certainly your Argument will hold good, or else it is the poorest Sophism that ever was proposed with so *Great Assurance**: let us see then whether it will proceed any better after this Second Concession. *Eusebius owned, that the Scripture did expressly say our Saviour was Created*; 'tis Evident therefore that he did not sign the *Condemnation of the Term Created*. This, I persuade myself, you think to be nothing less than *Demonstration*, and that all Mankind must necessarily submit to the force of it, *excepting some through-pac'd Athanasians*, who, by a Long Habit of understanding implicitly with other Mens Understandings, have quite lost the Use of their own; and, by accustoming themselves to see with other Mens Eyes, are become so Miserably Blind, that they cannot perceive the Truth of your *Discoveries*. However I find I must run the Hazard of this Imputation; for I profess, wheresoever the fault lies, this Argument has no Weight at all with me.

* Bp. Bull Pretends with Great Assurance &c. *Prim. Christian*. Vol. IV. p. 153.

IF you mean that *Eusebius* owned and believed, that, in the Doctrine and Language of the Inspired Writers, our Blessed Saviour was really and properly a *Created Being*; then your Argument stands thus subdivided into two.

EUSEBIUS believed our Saviour to be a *Created Being*; therefore he *could not Sign the Condemnation of the Word Created on his own Principles*.

EUSEBIUS could not Sign the Condemnation of the Word Created on his own Principles; therefore he did not sign it.

NOW though the First of these two Arguments should be good and Conclusive, if the Second be not so too, the Present Dispute will not be affected by either of them. And indeed I must own, that the Consequence of the first Argument proceeds rightly and truly: but then I do also affirm, that the Assumption, from which that Consequence is drawn, utterly destroys the Consequence of the Second. For if it was really *Eusebius's* Opinion and Principle, that our Saviour was properly speaking a *Created Being*, it necessarily follows, that he could not Subscribe the *Nicene Creed on his own Principles*, nor with a safe Conscience;

science; since the whole Tenour of the Creed, and particularly the following indisputably Genuine Articles of it, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἢ ποιηθέντα, and ὁμοῦσιον τῷ πατρὶ, are utterly Inconsistent with that *Arian* Notion, and directly opposite to it. And since, if the Minor Proposition of the first Argument be True, *Eusebius Signed* a Creed, which *he could not possibly Sign on his own Principles*; that Proposition manifestly Invalidates and overturns the Consequence of the Second Argument, which is, that he did not *Sign the Disputed Clause*, because *he could not do it on his own Principles*. The one supposes him to have been a Man of Great Integrity: the other Proves he was not. The one supposes him to have acted always conscientiously, and *on his own Principles*: the other proves that he had no *Principles*, except the Strong Principle of Self-Preservation.

BUT this Clashing and Inconsistency betwixt the two Arguments is not the only Defect I find in them; for I do farther affirm, that the Assumption of the first, upon the truth of which they both depend, is Groundless and False. I assure you, I speak what I have well considered,
and

and will maintain; and, in requital for this Challenge from you which I am now answering, I do here challenge you, and the *two other Learned and Judicious Persons*, your Seconds, to prove, that *Eusebius owned* and believed that in the Doctrine and Language of *Scripture* our Blessed Saviour was really and properly of a *Created Nature*. *Eusebius's* Orthodoxy in some other Points may perhaps require a more Able Advocate: but in this, I think, the Case is very Clear; and if you have any thing to offer against it, which has not been already answered, you shall find me Prepared to defend what I have here asserted.

TO return to your Argument, I have Considered it in one Meaning, and proved it to be False, and Inconsistent with it self. But your Words may perhaps be thought to admit of another Meaning (*viz.*) that *Eusebius owned* that the Verb *κτίζεν* in its Derivatives had been used of our Saviour in Holy Scripture; though he understood it in no other Sense, than as barely Implying Production and Origination. One of these two must necessarily be your meaning in this place; for if *Eusebius did own* that the word *κτί-*

ζειν was used of our Saviour in *Scripture*, which is here supposed and allowed you, he must understand it, either of a Temporary * Production *ex nihilo*, or a Production without any Limitation. The Argument built upon the former Sense has been refuted; the Other comes now to be examined. I have proved indeed already that *Eusebius did not own*, that the word was in any Sense applied to our Saviour in the Principal Text alledged for that purpose; it lies upon you therefore to name another, where you *think Eusebius owned* that the word was so applied: and such a Text I believe you will find it not very easy to fix upon; for as to the famous Passage *Coloss. I. 15.* πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, that is much rather a Proof that our Saviour was not *Created* than that He was, as might be very clearly made out, if the Course of my Argument led me to it. But I am here proceeding with you upon the Supposition and Imaginary Concession that *Eusebius did own that the word κτίζειν was used*

* By *Temporary Production* I do not mean such a Production as was effected in *Time*, according to the more Strict and Philosophical Sense of that Word, in which it is restrained to that Duration which began with the Creation, and is measured by the Periodical Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies: but a Production, which had a Determinate Beginning, preceded by a Boundless Duration; according to the more General and Vulgar Acceptation of the Word *Tempus* or *Time*. This I have to prevent Unnecessary Cavils.

of our Saviour in *Scripture*; from which Concession I say it will not yet follow, that he did not *sign the present Clause*. For either he understood that Word as *Arius* did, or he did not: If you say he did, you have been answered under the former Head; if you say he did not, I must ask you, why you think he adhered so religiously *to the Words of Scripture*, that he could not forbid the Use, or rather the Abuse, of a *Scriptural Word*, when *wrested* from its true Meaning, and perverted to a Blasphemous Signification. You will tell me, I suppose, that it was *Eusebius's Principle to keep close to the Words of Scripture under every Article*. But to this I reply, that *Eusebius*, by your own Confession, *signed the Clause & πονθέστα*, and *thereby signed the Condemnation of a word* which is often applied to our Saviour, even in the New Testament, and much oftener than the word *κρίζεν* can be pretended to be. And hence it necessarily follows, either that it was not *Eusebius's Principle to keep close to the Words*, but to the Sense, of *Scripture*; or that he did not keep close to his Principles in signing the Creed and its Anathemas. One of these Consequences must be True; and, by my Consent, you shall freely take your own Choice of them. If you chuse the first, you must own your Assumption to be False; If the
second,

second, you must own your Consequence to be False, and your Assumption Impertinent.

I HAVE now Considered your Argument in all its Views, and in all its Parts, and in all the Different Senses it will bear; and have proved it to be Groundless, and False, and Inconsistent with it self: and after this I think I may be allowed to say, that till you can give us some better Reasons why *Theodorit's* single Copy should be Prefer'd to the other Three, *Eusebius* must be accounted, a *Principal Witness* in this Cause, it is true, but For *Athanasius*, not Against Him.

II. YOUR next *Witness* is *Cyrril of Jerusalem*. He, you say, in his ordinary MSS has not the *Nicene Creed* at all: but in the two best MSS of that Author, noted *Roe*, and *Casaubon*, he has a Compleat Copy of the same; and that as including the *Anathemas* also; but so that They Both entirely omit the Words before us.

AND here, Sir, though I should allow these two *Extraordinary MSS* to be as Good as you please, yet it is as Plain as any thing of this Nature can well be, that the Creed was added in them Both by Transcribers afterwards; and indeed so Plain, that you your self cannot but own it to be very Probable. But I should be glad to be informed upon what Grounds you are so very Positive, that these are the two best MSS of that

Author. Have you ever seen the MS or MSS, from which the *Venice* Edition was taken? Have you ever seen Cardinal *Hosius's* MS, from which *Grodecius* made his Translation? Have you ever seen *Prevotius's* famous *Vatican* MSS, or any other elsewhere? Have you so much as seen either of these *two MSS* which you commend so highly? Of the Two it is much more likely that you should have seen the latter, which is, or was, in the Possession of my Lord of *ELY*, whom you have had the Honour to serve in such a Relation that His Excellent Library, which was always Open to all Men of Letters, must necessarily be Open to you in a Peculiar manner: and yet I believe I may venture to say, you have not seen even that; at least it is not for your Credit to own you have seen it, after you have called that one of *the best MSS of this Author*, which in that case you must have known to be no MS, in any other Sense than that it was in *Casaubon's* Hand-writing, but only a Copy of a Collation taken by that Learned Man from a MS of an Unknown Age, and that too after all perhaps the very same which Sir *Thomas Roe* gave to the *Bodleian* Library, as the Surprizing Agreement betwixt them affords us room to suspect.

BUT I perceive a Collection of *Various*
Read-

Readings, and a MS, are Synonymous Terms with you here as well as in several other places, where you pretend to oblige us with a most Exact Account of what is, or is not, to be found *in all the MSS*, as if you had seen and collated all the MSS in the World, whilst all the Authority you go upon is what every body knows, the Notes of an Editor, who has perhaps compared the tenth part of the Copies extant of his Author. But what if the Editor says not a word of the Matter? How will you do then to fright *the Athanasians* out of their Senses with MSS upon MSS in Large Capitals? Why then, it seems, the Case is still better for you; the Field is then all your own, and *all the MSS in Europe* shall say whatever you and the *two other Learned and Judicious Persons* your Friends think fit to have them say. *The MSS* indeed are all this while at *Rome, or Paris, or Florence, or Vienna*; But what then? You, who can write an History of the Fourth Century by Conjecture, and can tell what was Thought in the Second upon the Strength of your own Imagination, may easily read a MS at a greater distance than any of these Places.

BUT I leave you to the Chastisement of the Criticks for this Encroachment upon their Province, and Proceed to Observe farther, more seriously than this Allegation de-

serves, that *the Copy of the Nicene Creed in these two MSS*, amongst a great many other Variations from your True Copy, gives us in the body of the Creed two very Considerable Words, ἀνάρχως and αἰδιώς, which we find in no other Copy; and in *the Anathemas* omits ἡ ἁγία, as well as ἡ κτιστὴν, so that *whenever, or wheresoever*, these *MSS* were written, nothing can be concluded from any Omission made by such Transcribers.

III. *HILARY*, you say, in his *Book of Synods*, has an entire Latin Copy of the *Nicene Creed and Anathemas*, but without this Clause. Yet has this Entire Copy 7 Omissions, besides as many other Variations from your True Copy. Neither am I afraid to shew you another Copy in *St. Hilary*, without this Clause (*Fragm. col. 415*) which has above 20 Variations from that in his *Book Of Synods*.

IV. *LUCIFER* of *Cagliari*, I confess, gives us the *Creed and Anathemas*, without the Clause in question: but then he has omitted no less than 8 other Words, and particularly ἡ ἁγία in *the Anathemas*, besides other Variations from what you call *the True Copy*. He is not therefore, I think, in this Case so Valuable a Witness as you pretend.

V. *THE Author of the Exposition of the Creed among the Works of Athanasius*, you say, *does also entirely omit the same Clause.* A Treatise written upon *the Nicene Creed*, where the words before us were not to be found either in the Copy of the Creed it self, or in the Comment upon every single Article of it, would be, I confess, a very Plausible *Attestation against their being Genuine*: but This *Exposition of the Creed*, though that be the Title indeed which the Transcriber thought fit to give it, is rather a Private Creed, made out of the Publick Creeds of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, with several Alterations and Additions of the Compiler's own; so that it cannot be of the least Authority in the Present Debate. Besides, as Large as this Creed is, *πὲν γεννηθῆναι ὁὐκ ἦν*, an Undisputed Clause of *the Anathemas*, is omitted as well as *ἡ κτιστόν*. To which I shall only add, that there is a Manifest *Hiatus* here, which shews that something has very Probably been left out — *ἢ ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ ἐσίας Φάσκοντας εἶναι τὸ ὕμνον τῷ Θεῷ, ἢ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τρεπλὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν, τῶν ἀναθεματίζομεν.* But of this *Chasm* I may perhaps have occasion to say something more hereafter.

VI. *BASIL*, it is true, *has not the Present Clause in either of his Copies*: but that these two Copies are Exact and Entire I cannot

so readily allow to be True; for the First of them differs often from the Second, and from your *True Copy* much oftener, and particularly in the Body of the Creed Θεὸν ἐκ Θεῶ is omitted, an Article retained in all the other Copies I have seen, except One. This Clause indeed was omitted by the Council of *Constantinople*, when they ratified and *improved* the *Nicene Creed*, and that in all Probability because it was manifestly Included in Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεῶ ἀληθινῶ (as τὰ τε ἐν ταῖς ἑρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, and τετέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς seem to be omitted in the same Creed because fully Included in τὰ πάντα, and ὁμοούσιον) and if we suppose that *Basil* omitted it upon the same account, why may we not also suppose, that *the Clause before us* might be omitted by some, in the same Study of Brevity, and for the same Reason, as fully Included in the Expressions before Condemned, ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε ἐκ ἦν, and ἐξ ἐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο?

I MUST add, that *Basil*, in the words immediately following both his Copies, seems to affirm, or rather to take it for granted, that the Word *Created* was Condemned by the Council of *Nice*. " This, says he, is our Faith. But for-
 " as much as the Controversy concerning
 " the HOLY GHOST is not explicitly de-
 " termined in this Creed, the πνευμαλιόμαχοι
 " not

“ not being then risen, the *Nicene* Fathers
 “ did not Anathematize those who say
 “ that the HOLY GHOST is of a *Created*
 “ and *Servile* Nature. For there is no-
 “ thing *Created* in the Divine and Blessed
 “ TRINITY *.

BUT the whole Turn of this Passage, as it stands in the Greek, and particularly the Words εἰρήνησαν τὸ χρῆμα ἀναθεματίζεσθαι, have a much plainer Reference to the Condemnation of the Word *Created* when applied to our Saviour, than I can possibly preserve in a Literal Translation, without the Danger of making it more Plain than you may perhaps be willing to allow it is in the Original: but I believe I may safely appeal to any Unprejudiced Person, whether *Basil's* Words will not justify the following Paraphrase of them.

“ THIS is our Faith, and the Faith of the
 “ *Nicene* Fathers. But you are not to wonder
 “ that they did not Anathematize those who
 “ say that the HOLY GHOST is a *Creature*;
 “ for the *Pneumatomachi* not being then
 “ risen, you see they have not Defined any
 “ thing against their Heresy in the Creed,
 “ but left the Article as they found it in

* Πιστεύομεν τέτοις· ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἀδιόριστος ἐστὶν ὁ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λόγος, οὕτω τότε ἡ πνευματομαχίαν ἀναφανέντων, τὸ χρῆμα ἀναθεματίζεσθαι τοὺς λέγοντας τῆς κηρῆς εἶναι καὶ δουλικῆς φύσεως τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, εἰρήνησαν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅλως τῆς θείας καὶ μακαρίας τρεῆδος κηρῆς. *Basil. Op. Tom. 3. Epist. 60. p. 90. Vid. etiam Epist. 78. p. 138.*

“ the Apostolical Creed; and thence it is
 “ that they have not Condemned those
 “ Hereticks in their Anathematisms, which
 “ answer exactly to the Creed, and were
 “ made against those Hereticks only,
 “ whose Heresy had been Particularly Op-
 “ posed in the Body of the Creed. For
 “ this reason, I say, they did not then
 “ proceed to Anathematize those who call
 “ the HOLY GHOST a *Creature*, and not
 “ because they thought that Expression
 “ might be used of the Third Person in
 “ the TRINITY, any more than of the
 “ Second. We are not to believe there-
 “ fore, that by Condemning that Word
 “ no otherwise than when spoken of the
 “ SON of GOD, they tacitly allowed it to
 “ be used of His Blessed Spirit; for it was
 “ Certainly Their Faith, as it is Ours,
 “ that there is Nothing *Created* in the E-
 “ ver-Blessed TRINITY.

IF this be not the Sense of *Basil's* Words,
 it will not be very Easy to make any Sense of
 them at all. For if the whole Passage does not
 proceed upon the Supposition, that the
 Word *κτῆδος*, as applied to our Saviour,
 was Anathematized by the Council of *Nice*;
 where is the Wonder that they did not
 Anathematize it, when applied to the
 HOLY GHOST? Or why should *Basil* un-
 dertake to give any account of their not
 Con-

Condemning it when used of the HOLY GHOST, especially in this Place, at the end of the Anathematisms, and in the manner he does it; if he knew that they had not so much as condemned it when applied to our Saviour, *but rather, by omitting it, had directly avoided its Condemnation*; as knowing that it ought not to be Condemned? Or could he otherwise have given such a Reason for his Assertion? "The Council of Nice did not Anathematize the Word *Created* when applied to the HOLY GHOST, and that upon no other account than because the Heresy of the *Pneumatomachi* was not then risen. Well, but how does it appear that this was omitted upon no other account? Why, because it could not be omitted upon any other account; for it was certainly the Opinion of the Council, that No Person in the Blessed TRINITY was *Created*. But where is the Connection betwixt this Reason and the Proposition it is brought to prove, if the Council be not supposed to have Condemned that Word as applied to the SON? Or how could *Basil* pretend to establish his own account of their declining to Anathematize those who call the HOLY GHOST a *Creature* from the Absurdity of believing that they did it, because they thought that Word might be used of the HOLY GHOST,

if

if he knew that the Council did not, and *durst not*, condemn it as applied to our Saviour?

IT may be Objected perhaps, that St. *Basil* only says that *there is Nothing Created in the TRINITY*, and not that the Council thought so: But the Particle *γὰρ* and the Course of the Argument manifestly prove that it is, and necessarily must be, *Basil's* Meaning in this Place, that the Council thought so. "*There is Nothing Created in the TRINITY*, therefore the Reason why the Council of *Nice* did not condemn those who call the HOLY GHOST a *Creature*, was because the Heresy of the *Pneumatomachi* was not then broached. Where is the Consequence or the Sense of this? How does it appear, that the Council of *Nice* waved the Condemnation of the Word *Created* when used of the HOLY GHOST upon no other account than the Later Rise of the *Macedonian* Heresy, because *Basil* and Others believed, or because it is certainly true, that *there is Nothing Created in the TRINITY*? But because the Council of *Nice* did really believe, that *there is Nothing Created in the TRINITY*, this indeed is a very Good Argument to prove, what *Basil* is Observing, that they waved the Condemnation of that Word, as applied to the HOLY GHOST, for no other Reason than because at that time there was no

Parti-

Particular Occasion for the Condemnation of it as so applied.

UPON the whole matter, I think I have made it appear that this Passage, immediately following the Copy of the Creed, affords us very good Grounds to believe, that in the Opinion of *St. Basil*, the Word *Created*, when affirmed of the SON, was anathematized by the Council of *Nice*, and consequently that the Clause was Originally in his Copies.

VII. *EPIPHANIUS*, you say, gives us two Creeds: The former very Like the *Nicene Creed*, as it was afterward Improved by the Council of *Constantinople*, with *Anathemas*, like the *Nicene*, at the End: The latter something Like that under the Former Head, with the Like *Anathemas*; in both which this Clause is entirely omitted. So that here we have another Eminent Eastern Witness against it.

THE Former is plainly made out of the Apostles Creed, the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, and the Old Eastern Creed: The Latter is very nigh thrice as Long as the *Nicene Creed*; and, except the beginning, no otherwise like either that or the Former, than as they are all three Orthodox Creeds. And the *Anathemas* annexed to them want another Clause, as well as this in each of the Copies. But your Consequence ought not to pass unobserved. *Epiphanius* gives

us two Creeds, the Former Very Like the Constantinopolitan Creed, with Anathemas like the Nicene, the Latter Something Like the Former, in both which this Clause is omitted; Therefore he is an Eminent Witness, that the Council of Nice did not insert the Word Created into their Anathemas.

THERE is, I confess, elsewhere in *Epiphanius* a Copy of the *Nicene Creed* and *Anathemas* without the Clause *, which your two Learned and Judicious Fellow-Labourers have overlooked. It seems, *Petavius* forgot to put in the Margin, *Nicaena fidei professio*, as he did by Mistake in the other place. This Copy is in the short Apology written by the Clergy of the Church of *Ancyra*, to clear themselves from the Imputation of Heterodoxy; which *Epiphanius* inserts into his Account of the Heresy of *Marcellus*, without the least Sign of his Approbation, but rather the Contrary. But this is what I do not at all insist upon, for I think I have very good Reason to conclude, that the Clause was Originally in this Copy; since *Eugenius* in his Apology presented to *Athanasius*, in the Name of the same Church of *Ancyra*, and written upon the same Occasion, and about the same time, clearly assures us, that

* H. 72. p. 843. 4.

the Council of Nice did condemn that Blasphemous Expression. This Apology *Montfaucon* found in his Travels into *Italy*, after he had finished the Edition of *Athanasius*, and he has since Published it at the Beginning of the Second Volume of his *New Collection*. And as its Authority is Unquestionable, so I think this Argument which I have drawn from it fairly proves, that the Copy of the Creed preserved in the Church of *Ancyra* had the *Disputed Clause*, and consequently that it was also originally in the Copy which the Clergy of that Church published in the short Defense and *Exposition of their Faith*.

VIII. YOUR next *Witness* is *St. Ambrose*, who, you say, has Also an Entire Copy of these *Nicene Anathemas*, but not a Syllable of the Present Clause; and is therefore Another Noted Western Evidence against it. This Noted Western Evidence then, it seems, has Also an Entire Copy of the *Nicene Anathemas*, as well as the Eminent Eastern Witness *Epiphanius* has of the *Anathemas* like the *Nicene*. And so far indeed there shall be no Dispute betwixt us: *St. Ambrose's Copy* shall be allowed to have as Good a Title to be called *Entire*, as those *Anathemas* like the *Nicene* in *Epiphanius*, till you can find the Clause η $\tau\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$ in the First of them, and $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\epsilon\kappa$ $\eta\upsilon$ in the Latter.

AMBROSE's Copy runs thus: *Eos, inquit, qui dicunt Erat quando non erat, & antequam nasceretur non erat; & qui ex nihilo factum aut ex alia substantia vel ousia dicunt esse aut Mutabilem aut Convertibilem Dei Filium, anathematizat Catholica & Apostolica Ecclesia.** After this he proceeds to shew, by an Induction of Particulars, that all these Expressions are not only Condemned by the Council of Nice, but also Contrary to Scripture and Reason. *Arrius Ergo Dicit: Erat quando non erat: Sed Scriptura Dicit, Erat: non dicit, Non erat. — Veniamus ad alia. Arrius dicit: Antequam nasceretur non erat, Sed Scriptura dicit omnia esse per Filium. — Arrius dicit Ex nihilo Dei Filium, Quomodo ergo Dei Filius? — Arrius dicit, Ex alia substantia. Quae igitur alia substantia aequatur Dei Filio, ut ex ipsa Dei Filius sit? — Arrius dicit CREATURAM Dei Filium, non sicut caeteras Creaturas. Quae enim Creatura non sicut alia &c. Arrius dicit Mutabilem & Convertibilem Dei Filium. Quomodo ergo Deus sit Mutabilis, &c.* This, in short, is the Course of St. Ambrose's Argument in this Place. What I would infer from it is so very Obvious, that I think I might safely leave the whole matter in the hands of any Unprejudiced Reader, to draw the Conclusion for him-

* L. 1. *De Fide ad Gratian. sub finem.*

self. And indeed the Case is so very clear, as not only to need no Illustration, but also scarce to admit of any. Yet since the Nature of the Dispute I am engaged in seems to require it of me, I will endeavour to collect the thoughts which occurred to me upon reading over this Chapter, and put them into the form of an Argument; though I must profess, that I cannot pretend to give any man half that Satisfaction and Conviction, which I believe will naturally arise in his own mind as he reads it himself in St. *Ambrose*.

IT is as Plain, as any thing of this nature can well be, from the whole Course of the Chapter, and particularly from the words *Veniamus ad alia*, that it was St. *Ambrose's* Design in this Place to Comment upon the Anathematized Expressions, and those only, and that too in the Exact Order in which they stood in his Copy; and to defend *the Nicene Anathematisms*, after the same manner as he had already defended the Doctrine established in the Creed, by Arguments drawn from Right Reason, and Divine Revelation. And since in this Comment, which he makes upon every one of the Condemned Expressions in its Order, he does not pass over *the Disputed Clause*, when he comes to the place where it ought to stand; since

he does not proceed to animadvert upon *Mutabilem & Convertibilem*, after he had finished his Observations upon *Ex alia substantia*, but inserts *the Clause before us*, with his Comment upon it, betwixt those two Clauses; there cannot be a Clearer Case in things of this Nature, than that *the Clause*, which stands in its Proper Place in St. *Ambrose's* Comment, stood also in the same Place in the Copy of *the Anathematisms*, upon which he was Commenting, as it came Originally from his own hand.

OTHERWISE the Course of his Argument is Unnecessarily interrupted, and whilst his Design plainly appears to be no other than to run over and briefly animadvert upon all the Condemned Expressions in order as they stood in his Copy, which Order he exactly keeps to, we must yet very Unreasonably suppose that he needlessly broke through his own Method, to insert an Expression, with his Comment upon it, amongst those which the Council Condemned, as if it had also been so Condemned, when he knew that the Council did not, nor *durst*, Condemn it. And this I say we must suppose to have been done Needlessly, for there could be no Occasion for his treating of this Expression at all in this Chapter, unless as Condemned by the Council, among the
others

others so Condemned; since he had discoursed of it very Largely in two foregoing Chapters, and there fully discussed this Point.

AND if there had been any Occasion for him to Examine this Expression in this Chapter, and he had designed to do so when he began to write it; If this only, of all the other *Arian* Expressions which escaped *the Anathematisms*, and are mentioned by him elsewhere, was to be Considered here; How came he to chuse this Remarkable Place for it above all others? Was he in such Great Hast to give this slight Stricture upon it, that he could not stay till he had finished his Design when he was just at the End of it, when there was nothing left to Comment upon but *Mutabilem & Convertibilem*, and then say what he pleased upon it, without any Confusion or Breach of Method? Or if this Expression was to be inserted and reflected upon somewhere or other among the Anathematized Expressions, why did he not take the first Opportunity of doing it, that the rest of his Comment might proceed orderly? After *Erat quando non erat*, which is a Necessary Part of the Notion of a *Created* Being, or after *Ex nihilo factum*, which includes the other, and is a sort of a Definition of *Creatum*, it might have been much more properly

inserted, than after *Ex alia substantia*. And when he had defer'd it so long, and passed over the most Proper Places for inserting it, he might surely, for method's sake, have defer'd it so little a while longer, as just to say a word or two upon *Mutabilem & Convertibilem*, and then he might have commented upon it, to the End of the Chapter, without any Impropriety or Confusion.

UPON these Considerations I think we have all the Evidence which can Possibly be expected in the Nature of the thing, that *the Disputed Clause* was really *Extant* in that *Entire Copy of the Anathemas*, which St. *Ambrose* transcribed into this Book of his; and Consequently that the Omission of it in the MSS, from which our Present Editions of *Ambrose* have been taken, cannot be accounted a *Western Attestation against it*, nor yet be Reasonably charged upon any Negligence in St. *Ambrose* himself, but must be either an *Arian Corruption*, or the fault of some Careless Transcriber.

THIS *Testimony* of St. *Ambrose* I have had the honour to propose, either by Letters or in Conversation, to several Persons of known Judgement and Sagacity, and they have allowed it to be Convincing and Satisfactory, which is an Argument with me that Nothing Solid or Material

terial can be brought to Invalidate it. Yet since it is so Particularly Remarkable in favour of *the Clause*, and affords us also something like an *Experimentum Crucis* to direct us to the True Cause of this Omision in other places, I shall fairly State and Consider all the Objections, which I think can possibly be raised against it.

(1.) THE First and Principal Objection which occurred to me, as I read over the Whole Chapter purely to see what could be Objected, is this. St. *Ambrose* concludes his Comment upon the Words *Ex alia substantia* thus, *Quod si ex alia substantia Filium dicent, ipsi se revincunt, & verbum substantiae quod metuunt confitendo, & Filium Creaturis, quibus praeferre se simulant, conferendo.* And then he goes on, *Arrius dicit Creaturam Dei Filium, non sicut caeteras Creaturas. Quae enim Creatura non sicut alia Creatura non est? Homo non ut Angelus, terra non ut coelum, sol non ut aqua, lumen non ut tenebrae. Nihil ergo praeferendo donavit, sed ad simplices decipiendos misero colore fraudem suae Impietatis obduxit.* " This suggests a very Probable Account of all the odd Circumstances in the Insertion of this Clause among *the Nicene Anathematisms*, without flying to the Unreasonable Supposition of any Defect in the MSS; a Supposition never to be made but in

L 3

" Cases

Cases of absolute Necessity. St. *Ambrose* in
 his Comment upon the Words *Ex alia*
substantia urges it upon *the Arians*, that
 though they pretend to exempt the Son
 of God from the Rank of other Crea-
 tures, yet by this Expression of theirs
 they bring Him down to a Level with
 them. This very Naturally put him in
 mind of the Noted *Arian* Saying *Crea-*
tura est, sed non sicut caeterae Creaturae.
 Accordingly he sets it down, and ani-
 madverts upon it, not as a Part of *the*
Anathematisms, but, *ὡς ἐν παρόδῳ*, as a Fa-
 mous Expression very much used by *the*
Arians, which chanced to occur to
 him, as he was examining the other *A-*
rian Expressions, which had been Con-
 demned by the Council of *Nice*. And
 that this is the true Account of the mat-
 ter, and not that which has been given
 before, seems very plain from St. *Am-*
brose's Comment upon *Arrius dicit Crea-*
turam Dei Filium, non sicut caeteras
Creaturas, which is perfectly of a piece
 with the Sentence which introduced it
 and gave Occasion for it, and proceeds
 upon the same Design to shew that *the*
Arians, whatever they may pretend, do
 not in reality allow our Saviour any Supe-
 riority of Nature above the other Crea-
 tures; and this he does without saying
 one Syllable of their Calling our Savi-
 our

“ our a Creature or a Created Being in
“ General, whereas if he had designed a
“ Comment upon the Clause ἡ κτισθὲν, he
“ would certainly have insisted upon the
“ Blasphemy of applying that Word to
“ the SON OF GOD. This Objection I have
proposed in all its Real Force, and at the same
time with the Strongest Colours which I
think can possibly be laid upon it by an
Adversary, who would make the best of
his Cause with any Regard to Truth: And
in Answer to it I observe,

1. THAT though this should be allowed
to be a Probable Account of the matter,
yet if the other be more Probable, we
must stick to that; for in such Cases,
where the Nature of the thing admits of
nothing like Demonstration, the Greater
Probability determines the Assent as natu-
rally and as Reasonably, though not to
the same degree, as Stronger Proofs can
do where they may be justly expected.
And whether the other be not in many
respects much more Probable, I believe I
might safely stand to the Decision of any
Unprejudiced Person, who will compare
them.

2. THE other is much more Obvious
and Natural, for which I appeal to any
Equal Judge, whether it did not first oc-
cur to him upon reading this Chapter in

St. Ambrose. And if this be True, which I think cannot be denied, it must be allowed to be a very Strong Presumption in favour of the Account I have given, and against that which I am now examining.

3. THE foundation of the whole Argument is, that we are not to have recourse to the Supposal of any Omission or Fault in the MSS but in Cases of absolute Necessity; and this Notion, if it be understood so as to reach the present Question, I affirm to be False and Injudicious. It may be true indeed that this Supposition is not to be made but in Cases of Necessity, if it be allowed that there is a Necessity for it when the Course of an Author's Argument proceeds rightly upon such a Supposition, and is broken and confounded without it; when it clears up every thing much better than any other Supposition which can be made: but if the word Necessity must be understood in its strictest Sense, I much question whether it be possible that such a Case should ever happen. The whole Passage is Nonsense, Confusion, and Contradiction: Let us but suppose that one Word is omitted, and all will be Rational, Clear, and Consistent. No. This must not be. Here is no Case of Necessity. It is not Necessary that this Author should be supposed never to have Contradicted himself, nor ever to have

have written Absurdly and Confusedly. And thus in any other Case which can be put, it will be very easy to find an Evasion to prove it no Case of Absolute Necessity; and so we must sit down Contented with what can be done towards Clearing the Difficulties in Antient Books by those Learned Gentlemen of *Obscure Diligence*, who cannot believe that the Best and most Judicious Authors wrote Common Sense, if it be *contra fidem Codicum*. But the most Able Criticks are always the farthest from paying any such Superstitious Veneration to *the Librarians*, and I do not find that they ever scruple to suppose that their MSS are Defective or in any other respect Faulty, if they have Good Probable Grounds and Proper Critical Arguments for it, though it be not a Case of strict Necessity. And as this is a Supposition, which no Man can think Unreasonable, who knows any thing of MSS; so in the Present Case Particularly I will venture to say it cannot possibly be thought so, in a Dispute which has its Rise from the Faultiness of Copies, and cannot be decided either way without fixing that Imputation upon some of them.

4. TO say that this Clause was Occasionally Introduced by meer chance, upon the
Acci-

Accidental Mention of something relating to it, is neither so Probable an Account as that which I have given, nor yet in it self at all Probable. It is agreed, that either *St. Ambrose* or his Transcribers have not been so Careful and Exact as might have been wished. The question is whether this Neglect shall be charged upon the Author, or *the Librarians*. And, it seems, to avoid the Absurdity and Injustice of charging it upon the Transcribers, whose Great Accuracy and Diligence is so very Notorious to the whole World, and so very Conspicuous in all the MSS extant; rather than believe, that these People could Sleep over their Dull Work, who were seldom perfectly Awake, we must be forced to believe it of so Judicious and Excellent a Writer as *St. Ambrose*; which, besides its Unreasonableness in the General Notion, is in this particular attended with several Improbable Circumstances. *In a Long Work*, we know, a Man may very naturally forget himself, and his Main Design: but that *St. Ambrose* should so strangely forget what he was about, in so short a Comment, upon so slight an Occasion as because the Word *Creatura* chanced to come in his way; that notwithstanding he had largely treated of it just before, and therefore was more likely to be tired with it, than very Eager upon it as New Subject,

ject, yet this Casual Mention of it should give him so Violent an Inclination to animadvert upon it, that he must do it immediately, and could not stay till he had finished his Comment, when he was within three short Lines of the Conclusion of it, where he might have treated of it as Largely as he pleased without any Confusion or Irregularity; and that this Violent Inclination, which forced him to break the Thread of his Discourse when he was just at the end of it, should yet spend it self so very soon, in half a dozen lines, and then leave him to the Quiet Prosecution of his former Method; This, I think, is very Strange, and Unaccountable.

5. IF the Course of his Comment upon *Ex alia substantia* Occasionally led him to consider this *Arian* Expression, though he knew it had not been Condemned by the Council of *Nice*, it is Infinitely more Probable, that he would have done it only as a Continuation of his Comment upon that Article, and not have began another Head of Discourse, in the same Form with which he Introduces every one of the Anathematized Expressions, and those only, *Arrius dicit Creaturam Dei Filium &c.* which words, *Arrius dicit*, plainly refer to his Copy of the Anathematisms, as if this had been there set down among the rest, as
an

an Expression of *Arius's* condemned by the Council.

6. IT is so far from being Probable, that the Reference St. *Ambrose* makes in the preceding Sentence to this *Arian* Expression, gave him occasion to insert it, and Comment upon it, that the Contrary is much more Probable (*viz.*) that the Reference in the Close of that Sentence was rather occasioned by the Article he was next to Consider. *Quod si ex alia substantia Filium dicent, ipsi se revincunt, & verbum substantiae quod metuunt confitendo, & Filium Creaturis, quibus praeferre se simulant, conferendo.* " If they will still
 " affirm that the Son is of another Sub-
 " stance (that is, not of one or the same
 " substance with the Father) they Contra-
 " dict and Confute themselves, by making
 " use of a word which they Condemn as
 " Improper and Unscriptural, the Word
 " *Substantia*. Here is a very Plain Contradiction proved upon them; nothing more therefore was necessary to be added to gain that Point. Yet he goes on to shew that this Expression of theirs leads them into another Inconsistency, since by applying it to the SON OF GOD they brought Him down to an Equality of Nature with the other Creatures, at the same time as *they pretended to Prefer Him before them.* This Contradiction how justly

ly soever it may be charged upon them, is not nigh so Direct and Apparent as the other; and therefore could not be added to make the Case Clearer, but was rather, in all Probability, suggested by the next Article, and used chiefly as a Transition. Otherwise he might as well have added it in the middle of this Comment, where he urges the Contradiction mentioned in the former part of this Sentence, their Using a Word themselves which they pretended ought not to be used at all. There I say he might have pressed this other Contradiction too, as well as in the place before us: but there, it seems, it did not occur, where yet it was as likely to have occurred upon any other account but that there in the Middle of the Comment the Article he was next to examine was farther from his thoughts than here at the very End of it: And as this was upon any other account as Likely a Place for him to have mentioned this *Arian* Expression, as that before us, so there are several Places much more Likely upon all other accounts; since every one of the preceding Clauses *Erat quando non erat, Antequam nasceretur non erat*, and *Ex nihilo factum*, gave him a much more proper Occasion to consider it, than he could find here under this Article *Ex alia substantia*. And from all this I think it may be Probably
and

and Fairly Concluded, that this Reference was rather suggested and occasioned by the following Clause, than *vice versa*.

7. THE Objection drawn from the Nature of St. *Ambrose's* Comment upon *Arrius dicit Creaturam &c.* as Plausible as it may perhaps appear at first sight, upon a little examination will be found, I believe, to be of no great force. For if this Comment was intended by St. *Ambrose* to be perfectly of a piece with the Sentence which is supposed to have occasioned it, and to proceed upon the same Design, without any regard to the word *Created* as Condemned by the Council of *Nice*; he would certainly have kept on his Comment upon *Ex alia substantia*, and then indeed it would have been all of a piece, but now, upon this Supposition, it is Unnecessarily and very Improperly Divided. What Occasion could there be for him to break off his Animadversions upon *Ex alia substantia*, and begin a new Section, and that too with the same Introduction which he sets before every one of the Anathematized Expressions; if he was so far from designing a Comment upon any Condemned Expression, that he did not so much as design to shew the Falseness or Impiety of any *Arian* Expression, though uncondemned, but only to proceed upon the foregoing Sentence, and to continue it by adding
another

another Argument to prove upon the *Arians* the Contradiction and Inconsistency he had there objected to them?

BUT it is needless to insist any farther upon General Proofs, since St. *Ambrose* himself, in this very Chapter, has informed us by a Particular Instance, in a Parallel Case, what he would Probably have done if his Design had been as it is here represented. The Place is very Remarkable, and therefore I shall set it down at large. *Arrius dicit: Antequam nasceretur, non erat; sed Scriptura dicit omnia esse per Filium. Quomodo ergo aliis dedit esse qui non erat? Cum autem dicit Impius; Quando & Ante, haec utique duo verba tempus ostendunt. Quomodo ergo negant Tempus ante Filium, & volunt prius fuisse quae temporis sunt: cum id ipsum, Quando & Ante, & Aliquando non fuisse, sit temporis.* Here we see St. *Ambrose* is upon the very same Design as he is pretended to be in the Place we are disputing about; he is answering the Famous *Arian* Evasion *Non erat Tempus ante Filium*, and proving that it makes them Inconsistent with themselves, as he does in the other place with respect to *Non sicut caeterae Creaturae*, but yet he keeps on his Comment upon *Antequam nasceretur non erat*. He does not begin again with *Arrius dicit Erat quando non erat* (or, *Antequam nasceretur non erat*)

erat) *sed non erat tempus quando non erat*: but he dispatches this Sophism under the Article where it occurred, and then goes on to the next Anathematized Expression.

HERE also we may observe, as a farther Answer to this Objection, that the Greatest part of the Comment upon *Antequam nasceretur non erat* is taken up with that *Arian* Palliation, as the Comment upon *Arrius dicit Creaturam Dei Filium* seems indeed to be wholly taken up with the like Palliation, contained in the words *Non sicut caeteras creaturas*. And it is not at all Strange, that he who had spent the Greatest part of his Comment upon an *Arian* Evasion before, should in this Place take up his whole Comment with an Evasion of the same nature; since the Impiety of the Expression would sufficiently appear from the Weakness of the Evasion made use of to palliate it. For if the *Arians* thought this Palliation Necessary, as it is plain they did by their adding of it, when he had shewn that it did not mend the matter at all, there was no Need for him to dispute farther against that Expression in this short Comment, nor to repeat what he had said of it in three foregoing Chapters; after he had proved that to Call our Saviour a *Created* Being, notwithstanding the softening Addition they made to it, did really bring

bring Him down to a Level with the other Creatures. This is so Manifestly Impious and Blasphemous, that he might very reasonably conclude, that if he had proved it upon them, as he certainly thought he had at least, there could be nothing more wanting to convince the Emperor, or any other Christian, how deservedly this Clause had been condemned by the Council of *Nice*, nor yet to give him the utmost Abhorrence of an Expression, which, however softened and palliated, did not in Reality allow the SON OF GOD, *by whom all things were made*, any Preeminence or Superiority of Nature above the rest of the Creation.

(2.) IT may perhaps be Objected by you or your *Learned* Friends, but I should be very much surprized to hear of it from any Person less Prejudiced in this Dispute, that St. *Ambrose* does not say *Creatum* but *Creaturam*, which is the Literal Version of *κτίσμα*, not of *κτίσων*. But this is so Poor an Evasion, and in effect so Plain a Confession that nothing Material can be Objected, that it can only be the Last Refuge of an Adversary, who is either Convinced but ashamed to own it, or fully resolved never to be Convinced; for which reason I should be a little surprized to hear of it even from you, and the rather because you cannot easily make this Trifling Ex-

M

ception

ception without acknowledging at the same time, that *St. Ambrose* has at least two *Syllables of the Present Clause*. The only Question therefore which you can move here, is whether the Addition of two Letters in the Word *Creaturam* more than we find in *Creatum*, be of weight enough to give us reason to believe, that, notwithstanding all I have said to the Contrary, *St. Ambrose* knew nothing of the Clause ἡ κτισθὲν. And this being the State of the Question, if it really can be made a Question, I must declare for the Negative; and that, 1. Because this Objection, purely to avoid the Great Absurdity of supposing that *St. Ambrose* did not translate the word κτισθὲν very Accurately obliges us to suppose him much more Inaccurate and Negligent in a point of much Greater Importance, the Method and Order of his Discourse. 2. The strictest Laws of Translation confine a Man only to Words, not to *Syllables*: And I believe there is scarce any Version extant, except of the Scriptures, where infinitely greater Liberties are not allowed and taken in every line, than this of rendering a Verbal Adjective by a Verbal Substantive of the same Signification. 3. *St. Ambrose* was not so very Exact in his Translation of *the Anathematisms*, as he must necessarily be supposed to have been all along, if this Argument be of any Force;

Force; and this is plain from the whole Copy of *the Anathemas*, and particularly from his rendering ἐξ ὧν ὄντων, *ex nihilo*, where a more Scrupulous Translator would probably have said, either *ex nullis extantibus* with *Lucifer* and one of *Hilary's* Copies, or *de non extantibus* with the other of *Hilary's* Copies and that in the Acts of the Council of *Ephesus*, or *ex nullis substantibus* with *Rufinus*, or *ex nullis existentibus* with the Copy in the Latin Acts of the Council of *Carthage*, or *ex non existentibus* with the Copy in the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon*. *Ex nihilo* indeed gives us the Sense of ἐξ ὧν ὄντων, and so does *Creaturam* give us the Sense of κτισθὲν, and I believe we shall not find that ἐξ ὧν ὄντων is much oftener rendered by *ex nihilo* than κτισθὲν by *Creaturam*. 4. *St. Ambrose* every where, as I remember, and I am sure very often, uses the Words *Creatura* and *Creatum* promiscuously, and when he has Occasion to mention the Blasphemy of *the Arians* in calling our Saviour a *Created* Being, he uses *Creatura* oftener than the other; which also overturns the Foundation upon which this Objection is built, if it has any Foundation at all. And besides, in this Passage there was something Particular to determine him to the Choice of *Creaturam*, rather than its Synonymous

Word *Creatum*; and that was the Intention he had to subjoyn, *Non sicut caeteras Creaturas*, which made *Creaturam* the more Proper Word of the two in this place. Lastly, to use no more Arguments in so clear a Case, we find that the Council of *Nice* it self did not see any Occasion to be so precisely Exact even in the Original Language; for they tell us in their Synodical Epistle, that they had anathematized those who say our Saviour is *κτίσμα* *Creatura*, whereas in their Anathematisms the Word Condemned is not *κτίσμα* but *κτισθὲν* *Creatum*. This Instance you may perhaps except against, but I hope you will allow your own Authority to be very Good, and that you have Clearly *Demonstrated*, that *Athanasius* does several times directly affirm that the Council of *Nice* did even in their solemn Anathemas Condemn the *Arians* for saying that our Saviour was Created; though of the four Plain Passages quoted to prove it, the word *κτισθὲν* is only in one, and in the other Three *κτίσμα*.

(3.) ANOTHER Objection, which may possibly be made, is this. "St. *Ambrose* adds here, *Non sicut caeteras Creaturas*, a Clause not extant in any Copy of the *Anathemas*. These Words were added either as a Part of the Anathematisms, or not as a Part of them.

‘ If

“ If they were added as a Part of the
 “ Anathematisms in his Opinion, his Testi-
 “ mony cannot be of the Least Use in
 “ this Dispute: If they were not added as
 “ a Part of the Anathematisms, they are
 “ very Improperly and Immethodically in-
 “ serted in this place, where he proposed
 “ to consider no other Expressions, but
 “ those which had been condemned by
 “ the Council of *Nice*. But what
 Reason can possibly be given, why
 St. *Ambrose*, after he had set down the
 Expression condemned by the Council,
 might not add the Softening Explication
 which *the Arians* put upon it; in order
 to leave them not the least Colour for any
 Pretense, that he had not represented them
 fairly? What Confusion or Impropriety is
 there in this Addition, which was not
 made till his Method had been fully secured,
 by setting down the Condemned Expres-
 sion in its proper Place, and introducing
 it with the same Words with which he
 had begun his Comment upon every one
 of the other Condemned Expressions? *Non*
erat Tempus ante Filium was another Com-
 mon Expression among *the Arians*, of
 the same Qualifying Nature with that
 which we are now considering, *Non sicut*
caeterae Creaturae, and used with the same
 design to soften their Bold and Shocking
 Expressions with respect to the Beginning

of Existence which they ascribed to our Saviour, as this was to palliate the Grossness of calling Him *a Creature*. This Evasion of theirs St. *Ambrose* examines in the Comment upon *Antequam nasceretur non erat*, and takes up above two thirds of that Comment with it. Now if he had begun that Article thus, *Arrius dicit Antequam nasceretur non erat, sed non erat tempus ante Filium*; Would there have been any thing Improper or Immethodical in this? Would the Insertion of this Expression immediately after the Anathematized Clause have quite broke the Method of his Discourse, which now stands within a few lines of it without any Breach of Method? Or could any man have gathered from it, or even suspected, that he had no regard to $\pi\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \eta\mu\iota\varsigma$, nor any design to Comment upon it as an Expression condemned by the Council of *Nice*?

BESIDES if the Addition of the Words *non sicut caeteras Creaturas*, be allowed to prove that St. *Ambrose*, when he wrote this Paragraph, *Arrius Dicit Creaturam Dei Filium &c.* did not design a Comment upon the Clause $\eta\ \kappa\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, nor knew of any such Clause in the Anathematisms; I will not undertake to secure him from the Danger of a stronger Suspicion concerning his Integrity, than many of those which have been raised against *Athanasius*. And as it

is utterly Inconsistent with St. *Ambrose's* known Character, to suppose him Capable of desiring to make his Readers believe, that the Council of *Nice* had condemned an Expression, which he knew they had not condemned; so any Account of this Matter, which supposes or Insinuates any thing like it, is for that Reason very Improbable, and the Account which guards against it, which I think none effectually does or can do but that which I have given, is also, for that Reason, still the more Probable.

THESE are all the Objections, which I think can possibly be made against the Conclusion I have drawn from St. *Ambrose's* Comment upon the Anathematized Expressions. I have proposed them as Clearly, and as Strongly, as I could have done if my Design had been, not to defend, but *to convict, Athanasius*; and I have examined them as Impartially, as I could have done, if I had not been at all concerned in this Dispute. All I fear is, that I have dwelt too long upon them, and answered them much more Largely than they Deserved: but St. *Ambrose's* Testimony is in this Case so very Valuable and Remarkable upon many accounts, that I was willing to make it as Evident and Unexceptionable as I could.

HOWEVER, I find I must be more Tedi-
ous still, for there is just now come to
my Hands very Opportunely a New Book
of yours, called a *Collection of Ancient
Monuments*, in which you have *Reprinted
and Improved* this Charge of *Forgery against
Athanasius*; and it happens very conveni-
ently that this Case of *St. Ambrose* is ho-
noured with your *First Improvement*, which
I shall set down and consider at large.

ONLY it must here be Noted, that when
in the following Explication of the se-
veral Anathema's, he in the place of
the Spurious Clause mentions the Arians as
having falsely asserted that the Son was a
Creature, but not as the other Creatures,
he seems to Hint at Somewhat which now
does not appear in any Copy. Perhaps some
Attempted to have procur'd the Condemnation
of Some Such Arian Expression in this Place,
but failed; whence a Handle was taken by
Athanasius to make this Interpolation after-
ward*. This, I confess, is an Improve-
ment upon *Athanasius* convicted of *Forgery*,
but a very needless one, in my opinion;
of this sort of *Demonstrations* built upon
Seeming Hints, and *Somewhats*, and *Per-
haps's*, we had a pretty tolerable Number
before, without this, sufficient I think to
Satisfy any Conscionable Adversary: but

* P. 200.

let us see if we can spy out any Sense through this strange Mist of Words.

1. IN the first place you say *he seems to hint at somewhat which now does not appear in any Copy*. This he cannot possibly seem to do upon any other account than one of these three, either because he does not say *Creatum* but *Creaturam*, or because he subjoyns *non sicut caeteras creaturas*, or because his whole Comment upon this Article is taken up with that Additional Clause; all which Objections have been largely answered already. And therefore, as this *seeming Hint* is the sole Foundation of the long *Perhaps* which follows it, your whole Supposition falls to the ground at once without any farther trouble.

2. BUT lest you should take it ill, that so *Notable an Improvement* should not be thought to deserve a more Particular Examination; I proceed to Consider what this *somewhat* was, *which is seemingly hinted at by St. Ambrose, and now does not appear in any Copy*. To discover this, you have advanced the following most Sagacious Conjecture: *Perhaps some attempted to have procur'd the Condemnation of some such Arian Expression in this place, but failed*. Here by *some such Arian Expression* you must certainly mean an *Expression*, in which the word *Created* or *Creature* was in *some Manner* or other applied

plied to our Saviour: but what this *Expression* was or could be, I should be very glad to be informed.

WAS it ἡ κρισις, *the Disputed Clause*? Then your Argument contradicts and destroys it self; for this *does now appear in several Copies*, by your own Confession.

WAS it κτίσμα ὅτι ὡς ἐν τῇ κρισιμότητι, *Creaturam non sicut caeteras Creaturas*? This I cannot easily believe that any body did, or would, or could upon any reasonable Motive, propose to the Council with a Design to *procure the Condemnation of it in this Place*. For those who are supposed to have *attempted* this, and *failed*, must certainly be the Warmest Men against *the Arians* in the whole Council; and therefore it is highly Probable, that they would have first *attempted* to get the word κρισις or κτίσμα *Condemned*, as it was first used by *the Arians*, without taking any notice of the Palliation added afterwards to qualify the harshness of that Shocking *Expression*. And if they had *failed* in this *attempt*, there was no Possibility left for them to hope that the Council, which did not think it Blasphemous to call our Saviour *a Creature*, could think it Blasphemous to say He was *a Creature*, but not as One of the Other *Creatures*. Besides we are very well assured, that *the Arians* could upon occasi-

on

on make softening Additions to the other *condemned Expressions*, and yet we see the Council has not given us any of those Palliations in the *Anathemas*; and can we think that these *Violent Party-men*, in a Proposal, which was too Extravagant for the Council to come into, could be more Moderate and Favourable to the *Arians*, in the Heat of their Zeal, than that very Council, which rejected this Proposal of theirs, was in their Cool Determinations? And after all, if they did attempt to procure the Insertion of this *Expression* into the *Anathemas*, this was not, I think, the Proper Place for that Purpose. The Method observed in Composing the Anathematisms was plainly and visibly this, first to set down those *Expressions* which made up a Compleat Sentence of themselves, as ἡν ποτε ὅτε ἐκ ἡν, and the like; and then to joyn the shorter *Expressions* together by the Particle ἡ, and make one Sentence of them, that τὸ ὕδιν ὃ θεός might not be needlessly repeated, but serve at once for them all. Now the Clause we are considering is longer than any one in the *Anathemas*; and therefore it is not very Reasonable to suppose, that any body in the Council would attempt to get it inserted in this place, in the middle of the Sentence made up by the short *Expressions*.

BUT

BUT since κτίσμα ἐκ ὧς ἐν τῷ κτισμάτων could not, let us see whether κτίσμα ὧς ἐν τῷ κτισμάτων could be the *Arian Expression*, proposed to be condemned, *but* rejected. Proposed, I think, it could not reasonably be, because it was used by very few of the *Arians*, and disowned by *Arius* himself: And Rejected, I am sure, it could not be, unless as perfectly Needless, and already virtually condemned in the other Anathematized Expressions; for I believe even you your self, as Timorous as you think the Council of *Nice* was, will not venture to say that they *durst not* condemn an *Expression* which was condemned by several *Arian* Councils.

THESE three are all the Noted *Arian Expressions* I can recollect, in which the word *Created* was applied to our Saviour: and though I will not trust my Memory so far as to affirm, that there were no other *such Expressions* in use among them; yet this I will venture to say, that no other can be Invented, which will not fall in with one of these. Since therefore none of these Three will suit with your Conjecture, I shall presume to set it aside, as Groundless and False. It may not be Improper however to Observe farther, as another Argument against this Conjecture of yours, that it depends entirely upon the Supposition, that St. *Ambrose* did not act sincerely

ly in this affair. That this is a Necessary Supposition in your Scheme, is too Obvious to need any Proof: That it is a Supposition Absurd enough to overturn any Scheme, which cannot stand without it, every unprejudiced man must allow, if he knows any thing of St. *Ambrose's* Life and Character.

3. BUT St. *Ambrose*, I find, is not abused Alone: *Athanasius* must be brought in for His share, whatever comes of it; for thus you conclude this most Important Improvement, *Whence a Handle was taken by Athanasius to make this Interpolation afterward.* And do you really believe now that this is any Confirmation of your Charge against *Athanasius*? Can you think it the more Probable, that *Athanasius made this Interpolation*, because some had in vain attempted to have procur'd the Condemnation of some such *Arian Expression in this Place*? Must not this Unsuccessful Attempt necessarily make it the more known and talkt of, and much more likely to be remembered, that the Council of *Nice* had not condemned any such Expression? Would not the *Arians* and *Eusebians* continually object to the Orthodox, that they had deserted the Council they pretended to follow, and boldly condemned a Scriptural Expression, which their admired Council of *Nice* neither did nor

durst

durst condemn, but rather by refusing to condemn it, did in effect declare their Approbation of it? Would not this be their Constant Language upon all Occasions? And did not the Orthodox give them Occasion to use it every day, by affirming that our Saviour was not *Created*, and that it was no less than Blasphemy in them to say He was? Could there ever be a Dispute, either Publick or Private, either in Writing or by way of Conference, in which those *Arians* who were present at the Council of *Nice* would not have frequent Opportunities to press this upon the *Athanasians*? Can we suppose that they would ever let slip any Opportunity of Defending themselves by an Argument so strong, and at the same time so very Opprobrious to their Adversaries, as the Authority of the Council of *Nice* it self? Must not all this necessarily make it as Notorious to the whole Christian World that the Council of *Nice* had refused to condemn the term *Created*, as that there ever was such a Council called and assembled? And is it not a Necessary Consequence of this, that *Athanasius's* Interpolation must Unavoidably be Detected as soon as ever He had made it? And did He then take a Handle to make this Interpolation from the utter Impossibility of Success, from the certain Prospect of Inevitable Ruin,

from

from such an Incident as would have immediately determined Him against it, though he had been before disposed to do it upon any other Motive? This was certainly the Strangest *Handle* that ever any Man *took* in his right Senses, except perhaps the *Handle* you *take* here to strengthen the Probability of the Charge you have brought against *Athanasius* from this Supposition of yours. Any other Man in the World but Mr. *Whiston* and *Athanasius* would have drawn a contrary Conclusion from these Premises: But, it seems, *every thing has two Handles*, according to the Old Philosopher; and why might not the *Unlearned* and *Bold Athanasius* take the thing by the wrong *Handle*, as well as the *Learned* and *Modest* Mr. *WHISTON*?

THUS we see in this short *Note* there are Three Conjectures, the First of which is Groundless and False, the Second is drawn from the First, and therefore Groundless though it followed rightly from the First, it does not follow from it, and therefore would be still Groundless though the First should be True, and is also in it self Improbable and Unreasonable; the Third is drawn from the Second and therefore Groundless, is Absurd in it self to the Last Degree, and is so far from being a Consequence

quence of the Second, that the contrary may with much Greater Reason be deduced from it. And this is the Formidable Specimen you have given us of the *Improvements* we are to expect in the Course of this *Demonstration*.

IT is now high time to proceed to your Next *Witness*: but as I dare not presume to hope that the Censure of Tediouſness has not passed upon me already, I find it is with me as with other Offenders, Despair of Pardon gives me a strong Temptation to persevere in my Fault, and add one Observation more upon this Head, as a Probable Collateral Argument, though perhaps not of it self a Distinct and Full Proof, that St. *Ambrose* knew the Council of *Nice* had condemned *the Term Created*. It is drawn from the following Passage in his Famous Epistle to the Emperor *Valentinian*: *Cum iis plane bene convenit Arriano, qui Creaturam Christum dicit, quod etiam Gentiles & Judaei promptissime consentunt. Hoc scriptum est in Ariminensi Synodo, meritoque Concilium illud Exhorreo, sequens Tractatum Concilii Nicaeni, a quo me nec mors, nec gladius poterit separare**. Here he says, he abhors the Council of *Rimini* for allowing our Saviour to be called a Creature or Created Being; then he gives the Reason why he abhors them for it, which is no other

* Op. Ed. Bened. Tom. 2. p. 862.

than his Firm Adherence to the Council of *Nice*. And from this I think it may be Probably concluded, that St. *Ambrose* knew that the Council of *Nice* had pronounced a Solemn *Anathema* against all those who should use this Expression of our Blessed Saviour ; and therefore, in Consequence of his Great Veneration for the *Nicene Fathers*, and his Fixed Principle to keep close to their Determinations, he could not but *abhor* and detest all those who, by using this Expression, or allowing the Use of it, shewed their Contempt of that Council, and stood Condemned and Anathematized by it.

BUT perhaps the Case may be made still Plainer. All this I think may be fairly and Probably drawn from the Passage before us, upon the Supposition that the Word *Traëtatus* signifies here nothing more than *Concilium Episcoporum, in quo de rebus Ecclesiasticis Traëtatur*, a Council or an Assembly of Bishops in which Ecclesiastical Affairs are treated of. Thus I confess the Learned *Du Fresne* understands it *, and I must also confess that of the many Different Senses in which it is used by Ecclesiastical Writers, I do not find that there is any other produced either by *Du Fresne*, or any other Lexico-

* Glossar. in Voce.

grapher, which it can possibly bear in this place: But what if we should suppose that *Tractatus Concilii Nicaeni* means the Written Decrees of that Council? *Tractatores*, though it generally signifies Commentators and Expositors of Scripture, is yet used by St. *Jerom* for Authors in general; and if the Writers were *Tractatores*, their Books might certainly be called *Tractatus*, Tracts or Treatises; and if so, why might not the same word be as properly applied to any thing Written and Composed by an Assembly, as by a single Author? *Tractatoria*, as I learn from *Du Fresne*, is used more than once by St. *Austin*, to signify a Synodical Epistle written to promulge a Sentence of Excommunication; and why then may not *Tractatus* here signify the Synodical Epistle of the Council of *Nice*, in which the Sentence of Excommunication given against *Arius* and his Followers is promulged, or *the Creed and Anathemas* in which that Sentence is pronounced? The Unknown Author under the Name of *Praedestinatus* uses the Word *Tractatus* for a Confession of Faith made by a single Bishop; and why might it not be used as well for a Creed or Confession made by 300? But it is needless to insist farther upon Analogy and General Probabilities; since the Word is plainly used

used in the Sense I contend for by St. *Ambrose* himself in the following Noted Passage: *Haec cum lecta esset Epistola in Concilio Nicaeno, hoc verbum in Tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quia id viderunt Adversariis esse Formidini**. Here it is plain beyond all Possibility of Contradiction, that *Tractatus Fidei* means nothing more than *the Nicene Creed and its Anathemas*; the same which a little lower in this Chapter he calls *Librum Sacerdotalem*, an Expression which you have proposed to *the Consideration of the Learned*, with a Large Context, as a Passage monstrously difficult to be understood, which must either *be applied to your Constitutions*, or else you *cannot at all tell what it means*†. But this by the by. What I would observe from the word *Tractatus* is, that if it be allowed to have the same Sense in St. *Ambrose's* Epistle to *Valentinian*, as it has in his Book *De Fide*, it will be still more clear, that he knew the Council of *Nice* had Condemned *the term Created*; For, unless he had directly told us he knew it in so many words, he could not easily have expressed himself more plainly than he does upon this Supposition. I *abhor* those, says he, who allow

* De Fide l. III. c. 15. p. 518.

† Essay on the Constitut. p. 604.

our Saviour to be called *a Creature*, following the Determinations of the Council of *Nice* in their Creed and *Anathemas*; which, in the most Obvious and Natural Sense of the Words, without the Least Force or Straining, may be fairly Paraphrased thus: I am firmly resolved to adhere closely to the Decrees of the Council of *Nice*, and upon that Principle I *abhor* and Anathematize all those, who presume to justify or permit the Use of this Blasphemous Expression, so solemnly forbidden and Condemned by that Council.

BUT though *Tractatus Concilii Nicaeni* should be understood to mean nothing more than *the Council of Nice*, even in that case I cannot see how he could have said that he *abhorred* the Council of *Rimini* for allowing our Saviour to be called a *Created Being*, in Consequence of his Adherence to the Council of *Nice*, if he had known that *this Council did not insert the Word Created into their Anathemas, but rather, by omitting it, did Directly avoid its Condemnation*. It may be Objected indeed, that as the Council of *Rimini* forbade the use of $\kappa\tau\omicron\mu\alpha \acute{\omega}\varsigma \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\tau\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, and therefore did not explicitly allow our Saviour to be called *a Creature*, but only by Implication; so St. *Ambrose* might understand *the Nicene Creed and Anathemas* in the same manner, and

and mean no more than that the Word *Created* was virtually condemned by the Council of *Nice* in the Anathematized Expressions of the same Nature and Import. But besides that this Objection proceeds only against the Supposition of a Necessary Consequence in the Argument I have proposed, which is seldom or never to be expected in such Cases, and was not so much as pretended to in this; Could St. *Ambrose* possibly say that in *abhorring* those who call our Saviour a *Created Being* he followed the Council of *Nice*, if he knew that the Council had not declared their *Abhorrence* of this Expression, or those who used it, *but rather, by avoiding* this Declaration, did in effect allow the Use of it? He might very well say he followed the Council of *Nice* in *abhorring* such as that Council had Anathematized: but to *abhor* and anathematize those whom that Council did not anathematize, *but rather by* refusing to condemn them after a full Examination, *did directly* pronounce them to be Innocent; this is not *following* the Council, but opposing and Contradicting it.

IX. YOUR Ninth Witness, the Unknown Author of a Work *De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos*, inserted both among *Ambrose's* and *Nazianzen's Works*, begins, you say, with the *Nicene Creed*, and its

Anathemas, but wholly omits the Clause before us.

THE Criticks seem to be generally agreed, and I think with very good reason, that this *Work* is not *Nazianzen's*; and if it be *St. Ambrose's*, we have seen already, that *the Clause before us* was in the Copy of the Anathematisms which he had by him, and consequently that it ought to be in this Copy: But if *Vigilius Thapsitanus*, as you call him, was *the Author of this Work*, according to *Father Chifflet*, you have very providently polled one of your *Witnesses* twice over. Besides as this Treatise stands *among St. Ambrose's Works*, there is no Copy of the *Creed* or *Anathemas* prefixed to it, as you pretend. The *Benedictin* Edition of *Ambrose*, I perceive, led you into this mistake. Those Diligent Editors indeed have printed this Little Tract with the *Creed*, and *Preface*, and short Conclusion, which are added to it, as is given us *among Nazianzen's Works*. But it seems you was in such Violent Hast, that you could not find time to consult their *Admonition*, which lay open before your Eyes, when you *took the pains to search out this Testimony*: otherwise you might perhaps have been satisfied, that the *Creed* and *Preface* were not added from any MS or Printed Edition; but in all Probability for the same Reason as they were added by

Chif-

*Chifflet** (*viz.*) that no body might complain, that They had omitted any thing in their *Appendix*, which had the least relation to their Author. A Bad Edition of a Book has sometimes led very Learned Writers into such Mistakes, as a Man every way Inferior to them might easily correct, by the help of a better Edition: but this is the first Instance I have met with, where the Best Edition of a Book led Three *Learned and Judicious Persons* into such a mistake, as the worst Edition could not have led any Man into, though never so Ignorant and Injudicious.

AND after all, whoever was *the Author of this Work*, or of the Introduction added to it; this is Certain, that the Copy set before that Introduction cannot be of the least Use or Authority in the Present Debate; since, besides many other Omissions and Variations from the Common Copies, it omits fifteen Words together as well as *the Disputed Clause*, and those too the very Words which should stand immediately before it.

X. *RUFINUS*, the Earliest of the Ecclesiastical Historians after Eusebius, has a Compleat Copy of the Nicene Creed and its Anathemas; but no sign of this Clause.

* Nequid a nobis praetermissum queri possit studiosus Lector, quod ad Vigiliū pertineat. *Vindic.* p. 61.

THIS *Early Historian*, it is confessed, in our Present Editions, has not *the Disputed Clause*, among several other Variations from the Best Copies; but that he has *no sign of it*, is not altogether so certain. *Ἐπεπλὸν* aut *Convertibilem vel Demutabilem*, looks a little Suspiciously. What Occasion was there for *Ἐπεπλὸν* in this Place? Is it a Word of the Last Importance, that it should be thus Distinguished above all the other Condemned Expressions? Is it so very Difficult or Ambiguous a Word, as to make it necessary for *Rufinus* to set it before his Translation of it, that his Readers might judge for themselves whether he had given the true Sense of it or not? For these Reasons Translators sometimes retain the Words of the Original in their Versions, but neither of these Reasons will hold here. *Ἐπεπλὸν* is only a Consequence of *κπιτὸν*, and as Inconsiderable a Word as any in *the Anathemas*, and as easy a Word; and of a Signification as Determinate, as any in the Language. There cannot therefore, I think, be any Reason given, why so Experienced a Translator as *Rufinus* should so Cautiously retain this Word. But if we suppose him to have written *κπιτὸν* aut *Convertibilem vel Demutabilem*, some Account may be given of the Matter. *Κπιτὸν* was a Word of the greatest Importance in that

Con-

Controversy, and indeed the Hinge upon which the Dispute turned. Neither was it of so very Determinate a Signification, much less was *Creatum*, by which in all Probability he must have rendered it; for the word *Creare* very often in the Best Roman Authors, and in the Latin *Fathers*, signifies to beget *, as *Procreation* now with us; and otherwise too, according to St. *Austin* †, does not reach the Notion of *κτισθὲν*, as rather signifying to make, *ex eo quod erat*, whereas the other properly signifies to make *ἐξ ὧν ὄντων*, or *ex eo quod non erat*.

IF any man be so little acquainted with these matters as to ask or wonder, how *κτισθὲν* could be afterwards changed into *τρεπθὲν*, as it now stands; I answer, that the two Words are not so very Unlike, but that the One might very easily get into the other's place, by the Assistance of the two Following Words *aut Convertibilem*; which might put the Transcriber in mind of *τρεπθὲν*, whilst he was perhaps studying to read *κτισθὲν*, and the Particle *aut* might confirm him in his Opinion by making

* Quamquam Latinae Linguae Consuetudine dicatur aliquando *Creare* pro eo quod est Gignere. *August. de Fide & Symb.* c. 4. p. 62. T. 3. Ed. Lov. *Creatus* est (Christus sc.) de eaque *quam Creavit.* Id. *Serm. 55. de Divers.* T. 10. p. 527. — *Creatus* est, non id ipsum sonat in Latino Sermone quod Graeco; *Creatio* quippe apud nos *Generatio* vel *Nativitas* dicitur. *Hieron. Com. in c. 4. Epist. ad Ephes.* T. 4. col. 372.

† *Creari* autem, *ex eo quod erat* condi aliquid vel *Constitui.* *August. c. Adv. Leg. L. 1. c. 23. T. 6. p. 254.*

Convertibilem look like a Translation of the Greek Word immediately preceding. This Account is strengthened and confirmed not only by the Great Improbability of the Contrary Supposition, but also by a Parallel Instance in *Socrates's* Copy of *Alexander's* Epistle to all the Bishops of the Catholick Church, in which *the Ari-ans* are said to have given the following Answer to a Question put to them: Ναὶ διότι· ὅτι καὶ φύσεως ἐστὶ, γεννητὸς καὶ ὅτι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ. Here there is no need of any Great Critical Sagacity to discover at first sight, that the True Reading is not *γεννητὸς*, but *καταγὰς*, according to *Athanasius* and *Gelasius*, in their Copies of this Epistle, which Reading *Valesius* approves of in his Note upon the Place, and suits his Translation to it, though he retains the word *γεννητὸς* in his Text, for want of Authority from the MSS to alter it, as I suppose; for if he had found *καταγὰς* in any of his Copies, he would certainly have told us of it in order to establish and confirm his Conjecture. It is evident therefore in fact, that *καταγὰς* has in some MSS been changed into *γεννητὸς*, and consequently that it is no Unreasonable Supposition in the present Case. This however I will venture to affirm, that many times neither so Probable an Account as this, nor indeed any Account at all, can be given

given for Alterations, which we are yet fully assured have been made in Antient Authors. And this, I think, may suffice to shew, that you was a little too Hasty, when you affirmed so Positively, that *Rufinus has no sign of this Clause.*

XI. *THE African Copy of this Creed and its Anathemas, brought from the Council of Nice by Caecilian then Bishop of Carthage, and solemnly read in a Famous Council held at that place afterwards; nay, and publickly inserted into its Acts; has not a Syllable of this Clause.*

THAT *Caecilian's Copy* was a True One, as also the Transcript taken from it and inserted into the Original *Acts*, we can have no reason to doubt: but that the two Copies in the Present Latin and Greek *Acts* are so, we have almost as little reason to believe. For in the first place the Greek Copy omits the word $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\lambda\omega\nu$, N°. 1. (2) $\chi\eta\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\nu}\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}\ \pi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\chi\eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ is inserted N°. 34. (3) In the Anathematisms N°. 41. the word $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon$ is omitted. (4) N°. 45. instead of $\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ we have $\omega\theta\epsilon\ \tau\tilde{\upsilon}$. (5) N°. 49. we have $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$. (6) $\upsilon\text{-}\pi\omicron\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ η is omitted N°. 50. (7) Instead of $\phi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, we have $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ N°. 52. (8) $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ is omitted N°. 53. (9) Instead of $\tau\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\acute{o}\nu\ \eta\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\omega\tau\acute{o}\nu$, we have $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\omega\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \eta\ \tau\pi\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{o}\nu$, N°. 55. Besides as many other Variations from your True Copy.

Some

Some of these indeed may perhaps be thought excusable in a Translation, but the most Material of them are out of the Benefit of this Excuse; and the rather because this Translation differs from the Pretended Latin Original in almost as many points, as those I have enumerated in which it differs from the other Greek Copies. And as for the Latin Copy it self, besides the Difference betwixt it and the Greek Translation supposed to have been taken from it so long ago, and some other Variations from the Common Copies, which I shall not stay to insist upon particularly; we have in the first place the words *de Spiritu Sancto* inserted N°. 22. which are notoriously Spurious, and acknowledged only by two Extravagantly Interpolated Copies, and the *two Creeds Like the Nicene* in *Epiphanius*. (2) We have a whole Clause inserted N°. 29. *Sedet ad Dexteram Patris*. (3) In the same place the word *Inde* is inserted before *venturus*, without the Authority of any Greek Copy. (4) N°. 47. *Esse*, the word which ought to stand immediately before the *Disputed Clause*, is omitted. (5) N°. 48. Instead of *convertibilem aut mutabilem*, we have *mutabilem & convertibilem*. It appears therefore, that neither the Latin nor the Greek is a True Copy of the *Nicene Creed*, and consequently that we can not

not learn from them, what was or was not in *Caecilian's Copy*, which was undoubtedly True and Exact, though perhaps it might not deserve the odd Title of an *Original Copy*, which you have bestowed upon it, any more than these Pretended Transcripts from it deserved the Great Solemnity, with which you have introduced them, for the same reason, I suppose, and with the same success, as other Diligent Sollicitors have sometimes, to the Great Diversion of the Audience, dressed up an Ordinary *Witness* in the Habit of a Gentleman, when the Evidence he was to give plainly discovered the Ridiculous Artifice.

XII, XIII. *AT the same Council of Carthage, you say, where the Pope of Rome had so Early pleaded a Forged Canon of the Council of Nice for Appeals to Rome, and endeavoured to bring the African Churches under his power thereby; a solemn Message was sent to two of the Patriarchal Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria, for Authentick Transcripts of the Creed and Canons of the Council of Nice, as they appeared in their Archives. Which Churches Soon returned them such authentick Copies; and they were both found exactly to agree with their own Copy, brought from Nice by Caecilian; and, by Consequence, had not the Clause before us. So that three of*
the

the most Famous Churches of the World, who had every one of them Original Copies of the Acts of the Council of Nice, and among them that of Constantinople very near Nice it self; and that of Alexandria, the Seat of Athanasius, are most Plain Attestations against it.

I AM not at all Concerned in the Pope's Dispute with *the African Churches*, nor in the Controversies it has occasioned among the Learned; for, I suppose, you will not pretend that *Athanasius* forged this Canon for *the Pope's* Use. I am not more concerned to enquire, whether this was *the same Council*, which is mentioned in the foregoing Article; or how long it was before *two of the Patriarchal Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria* returned them such *Authentick Copies*; or whether it be possible, that *three Churches* should every one of them have *the Original Acts*, or that any one Church should have an *Original Copy* of them, or any thing else. There is another Point too, which you seem to lay some stress upon, and that is the Distance betwixt *Constantinople* and *Nice it self*, which I think is as little to the purpose, as any of the other. When the Bishops broke up from the Council of *Nice*, do you think that those who had the least way to go, took with them more *Exact Copies* of the
De

Determinations they had agreed to, than those who were farther from home? Or that the *Nicene Creed* had such a strange Tendency to be corrupted upon the Road, that it could not be carried far from *Nice* without Great Danger of loosing its Exactness by the way? But to come to your Main Point.

THE Copies sent from *Constantinople* and *Alexandria*, you say, were both found exactly to agree with *Caecilian's Copy*; and, by consequence, had not the Clause before us. The *African Bishops* indeed, in their Letter to the Pope, affirm that in the Copies sent them from *Alexandria* and *Constantinople* they cannot find the Canon, upon which he builds his Claim, and at the end of the Copy of the Creed supposed to come from one of those Churches, it is said, that the *Canons annexed to it* were the same which had been written out before (which Bp. *Beveridge* makes to be a Note of *Zonaras's*) But I do not see that it is any where said in the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Africanae*, that the Copies of the Creed, which came from those Churches were found exactly to agree with their own; or that the Whole *Acts*, as you call them, including the *Creed* and *Anathemas*, were found, upon Comparison, to agree so exactly with those, which *Caecilian* brought from *Nice*. Neither

ther had they any Occasion to make such a Comparison, or to collate so much as the Copies of the Canons *with their own*, any farther than barely to see, whether that *Canon*, which *the Pope* had quoted upon them, was Genuin or Spurious, which could not but appear immediately upon the most Negligent View.

YOUR *Consequence* comes next to be Considered, which depends not only upon the foregoing Proposition, but also upon the Supposition that *Caecilian's Copy had not this Clause*: But we have already seen, that you have not proved, nor can prove, that *Caecilian's Copy had not this Clause*; and, by *Consequence*, your Conclusion is Precarious and Illogical.

BUT I wonder that you should content your self with such an Uncertain Deduction as this, when the very Page in Bp. *Beveridge's Synodicon* lay open before you, which presented you with the Copy which is supposed to have been brought from one of these Churches. But that Copy, though *the Disputed Clause* be omitted, will soon appear to be so little for your Advantage in this point, that you will find, I believe, no great Reason to repent, that you did not insist upon it. For in the first Place the word *πάντων* is omitted N^o. 1. (2) N^o. 21. The Clause, *καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ*, is omitted,

which

which is Indisputably Genuin, and omitted in no other Copy but one, and that Intolerably Faulty. (3) N°. 22. It omits τὸς ἀνθρώπους. (4) N°. 23. the word ἀφ' is omitted. (5) N°. 32. the words τῇ τεύτῃ ἡμέρᾳ are omitted. (6) We have καὶ πάλιν inserted N°. 34. (7) In the *Anathemas* N°. 41. instead of ποτὲ we have καὶ γὰρ. (8) The Clause, καὶ πάλιν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἧν is entirely omitted, N°. 46. (9) N°. 53. Φάσκοντας εἶναι, the words immediately before the *Disputed Clause*, are omitted with it; Besides some other less Considerable Faults. And the *Agreement* betwixt this Copy, and that which you would have to be *Caecilian's Copy*, is so very *Exact*, that it does not omit quite Thirty Words, which are Extant in that Copy, to pass over other Variations. *Labbe* indeed, in the *Codex Canonum*, has given us a Copy, as from one of these *Patriarchal Churches*, which is not altogether so Imperfect as this: but they agree in the most Material Faults; and Particularly in the *Anathemas*, they both read καὶ γὰρ for ποτὲ, and omit καὶ πάλιν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἧν, and Φάσκοντας εἶναι.

UPON the whole Matter, it is Evident, that we have not the least Tolerable Grounds, either from the Pretended *Agreement with Caecilian's Copy*, or from the Omission of the *Clause* in the Copies I have just now collated, to believe or
O
suspect,

suspect, that *the Copies of the Nicene Creed in the Archives of Constantinople & Alexandria had not the Clause before us*; and therefore, notwithstanding all your Preposterous Triumph, you must give me leave to set this Double *Testimony* aside, as of no Use or Authority in the present Debate.

XIV. *IN the Acts of the Council of Ephesus*, and in the Epistles and other Writings, which the Compiler of those *Acts* has Published with them, there are *several Copies of the Nicene Creed, in all which this Clause is omitted*: but then these Copies neither agree with one another, nor with your *True Copy*; one of them Particularly in the Old *Latin Translation* published by *Baluzius* (for in the *Greek* it is cut off in the beginning with an *&c.*) omits and inserts whole lines together. But of the Copies in the *Acts* of this Council I shall soon have occasion to treat more largely.

XV. *SOZOMEN's Exact Account of these Nicene Anathemas* has indeed all the *Condemned Expressions*, except that in dispute; but there are several other words omitted which are in all the Copies of *the Anathemas*. Neither does it appear, that he designed to give an *Exact Copy* of them: so far from it, that he says he was dissuaded by his Friends from his First Intention of inserting a Copy of
the

the Determinations of *the Nicene Council*, upon the Old Principle of Concealing Mysteries from the ἀμύητοι. However, that his Readers might not be altogether Ignorant of the Decrees of that Synod, *ὡς μὴ πᾶμπαν ἀγνοεῖν τὰ δόξαντα τῇ συνόδῳ*, he tells them, that our Saviour was pronounced to be Consubstantial with the Father, and those Anathematized who presumed to say there was a Duration when He did not exist, &c.

XVI. *In the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon the Creed is several times repeated without this Clause.* But what Dependence can you have upon those Copies, when in that very Copy, which is pretended to have been inserted into the Solemn Definition made by the whole Council, which therefore one would expect should have been exactly Right, as belonging to a Council which was held in Bithynia, almost 40 Words are inserted which are not in your *True Copy*?

XVII. I COME now to your Second Improvement, which is no less than the Addition of a new *Testimony*.

CYRIL of Alexandria, the very Church of Athanasius Himself, does also intirely omit this Clause in his Copy; and thereby secures us, that it was not extant in the Records of that Church even in the Fifth Century.

UNHAPPY and Unfortunate Athanasius! You will give me leave to pity Him, I dare say; since you cannot forbear doing it your self, where there is as little Occasion for it. Here indeed His Case is Deplorable enough to move Pity in an Enemy, infinitely less Generous and Compassionate, than *the Reviver of Primitive Christianity*, who can condescend to look down with Great Commiseration upon the Ignorance and Superstition of the whole World against him. This *Clause* is most certainly *intirely omitted in the Copy* you refer to; and *Alexandria* was also most certainly *the very Church of Athanasius Himself*, as you have very Learnedly Observed, and most Emphatically expressed your Learned Observation. And is it not therefore Demonstration that *Athanasius propagated this Notorious Forgery over the Christian World?* Can any thing press harder upon *Athanasius* than this *Testimony of His own Church?* Can any man be so Absurd as to suppose, that if *the Clause* had been Genuin, it would not have *appeared in the Archives of Alexandria?* These are Specious Questions indeed at first sight; but take in the whole State of the Case at once, and consider the Particular Charge against *Athanasius* as well as the Authority of *the Clause* in general, and then all these Fine Questions will

will be resolved into this, or something not much more Rational: Can any Man in his Senses be so Absurd as to suppose, that He who would not *Interpolate* His own *very Church of Alexandria's Copy*, must not therefore necessarily *Interpolate* all the Copies He could come at, and spread *His Forgery over the whole Christian World*? But this Pleasant Consequence I shall have occasion to consider more largely hereafter.

IN the mean time I must complain of a Double False Muster in this Allegation. *Cyrill*, it seems, *hereby secures us, that the Clause was not Extant in the Records of the Church of Alexandria even in the Fifth Century*. But was you not *secure* of this Before? If you was not, you did not deal very fairly by me; for, I am sure, you gave me your Word for it, and under your Hand too, in a Letter I had the Honour to receive from you above a Year ago. Was you not *Secure* of it, when you brought in the *Church of Alexandria, the Seat of Athanasius*, with so much Pomp and Triumph, as a *most Plain Attestation against the Clause*? But perhaps you might have been *Secure* before, that *Alexandria was the very Church of Athanasius Himself*; and that this Clause *was not extant in the Records of that Church*; though

O 3

you

you was not altogether so well assured, *that it was not extant there even in the Fifth Century.* No, I cannot allow so much as this; for I must beg leave to be as Positive, that the Year 419 alls under *even the Fifth Century* it self, as you can be that *Alexandria was the very Church of Athanasius Himself.* And it is farther Observable, that this *Cyrill* was *the very Bishop of Alexandria*; who sent that Copy of the Creed to *Carthage*, from which you had before concluded, that *the Church of Alexandria was a most Plain Attestation against their Patriarch Athanasius.* Thus it appears, that we have heard *the Testimony* of *Cyrill* already, to prove *that the Clause was not extant in the Records of the Church of Alexandria*; and therefore this *Improvement* presents us with nothing but an *Old Witness* under a *New Name.*

BUT this is not all. For this very Copy of *Cyrill's*, which you here refer to, has been already alledged against *Athanasius* in this very Page, under the Article of *the Council of Ephesus.* If you think such *Testimonies* as these will do you any Service, and make a fine Shew in the Poll, though they must certainly be rejected in the Scrutiny; I can oblige you with another of the same Nature in this Part of *Cyrill's Works*, in his Epistle to *Nestorius* *ὡς ἡ ἀνωμολία*, inserted also into *the Acts*

Acts of the Council of Ephesus. But I am apt to think it would be more for the Credit, and not less for the Advantage, of your Cause, to content your self with a single *Testimony* from a single *Witness*.

AUBERTUS, the Editor, does not tell us whence he had these Epistles of *Cyrill*, *De Excommunicatione*, and *In Symbolum Nicaenum*: but it is as Probable as any thing of this Nature can possibly be, that they were either immediately transcribed into his Edition from *the Acts of the Council of Ephesus*, or at least into the MS, from which he took them. For in the first place, There is not the least Difference betwixt the Copies of the Creed in those Epistles, as they stand among the Works of *Cyrill*, and in *the Acts of the Council*; and, what is still more Remarkable, the Copy in the first of them has δι' ἧς ἐποίησε τὴν αἰώναν in the Margin, both in *the Acts of the Council* and the Works of *Cyrill*. 2. It is highly Probable, to say no more, that almost every one of the Epistles in the Works of *Cyrill* were transcribed from *the Acts of the Council*; for no less than six and twenty of them together, which make up above 70 Pages, follow one another exactly in the same Order as they now occur in *the Acts*. And this will be found to be still more Probable, if we con-

sider the Titles set before those Epistles: sometimes we have a Long Title, and in it the Argument and Contents of the Epistle, which might be a Necessary Introduction in the Course of *the Acts*, but it is very Strange and Unaccountable, that it should be done only before one or two in a Collection; sometimes we have τῷ αὐτῷ κυρίλλῳ, when several Pieces of his were inserted together into *the Acts*; sometimes ἴσον ἐπιτολῆς κυρίλλῳ, sometimes κυρίλλῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ ἀλεξανδρείας, sometimes ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ κυρίλλῳ, sometimes κυρίλλῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ, sometimes only κυρίλλῳ, &c. which Variations are natural enough in *the Acts*, where these Epistles are intermixed with other Writings of Different Authors, but I think a Collector of *Cyrrill's* Epistles would either have given always the same Title, or rather none at all, but only the Direction; at least, I think, he could not have given the very same Titles which they have in *the Acts*, if he had not Transcribed them from those *Acts*. Many other Considerations might be offered to prove the Great Probability of this: but it is so very Plain in it self, that no man, I believe, can doubt of it, who will take the Trouble to compare them.

IT appears therefore, that the Copies of these Epistles in *Cyrrill's Works*, and *the Acts of the Council*, stand upon the
 same

same Foundation, the Sole Credit and Authority of the Negligent Compiler of those Acts; and consequently *the Testimony* of St. *Cyrill* here alledged has been heard already, and is very Unreasonably obtruded upon us again in another form. He had said before all he could say for you, and Farther this Deponent saith not: but he has something farther to say against you; for in his first Dialogue *De TRINITATE* * he has a Copy of *the Nicene Creed with this Clause*. And that this is *Cyrill's* True Copy, and not either of the other two in *the Acts*, we have all the reason in the world to believe from the Gross Carelessness of the Publisher of those *Acts*, and the much Greater Probability that a Clause should be dropt out of two, I might say out of twenty, Copies, than be inserted into one. For the Clause was either Originally in all three of them, or in none of them. If it was Originally in them all, we must suppose that it has since slipt out of two of them, through the Negligence of Transcribers, which is the most Common thing in the World, and, as we have already seen, has most certainly happened once at least in this very Case: if the Clause was Originally in none of these Copies, according to your Way of account-

* Op. Tom. 5. p. 389, 90.

ing for such Insertions, we must suppose another Instance of *Forgery*, at a time when there could not possibly be the Least Occasion for it; and so there will be no End of these *Suspensions* and *Convictions*. And I can scarce think it Possible, that any Man can be Prejudiced to such a Degree, as to be Capable of doubting which of these two Suppositions is the more Reasonable.

UPON the whole, it is as Evident as we can expect or desire it should be, that *Cyrill* acknowledges the *Disputed Clause* to be a Genuin Part of the *Anathemas*, and thereby secures us that it was extant in the Records of that Church; and consequently, since two Copies in the *Acts of the Council of Ephesus* came from *Cyrill's* own hand, and the other you refer to from a Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*, who was Principal Notary to that Council, that the Copies in those *Acts* originally had the Clause before us. And upon these Grounds, if I was in any Want of *Witnesses*, I might cite the *Council of Ephesus* as a more Eminent Evidence than many of yours on the other side. But I will not be so Hard with you, I can afford to wave several Advantages without any Danger to *Athanasius's* Reputation, and you may take it as a Favour, if you please, that I only set down *Cyrill* as a *Witness* For the Clause, and content myself

self to set aside *the Council* as no *Witness* Against it.

XVIII. *GELASIUS* *Cyzicenus*, you say, *entirely omits the Clause before us, when he sets down the Nicene Creed and Anathemas by themselves.* This does not very well agree with the Objection you make against him, as a *Famous Transcriber from Athanasius.* But to let that pass. *Gelasius*, it is true, has a Copy of the *Nicene Creed* without this Clause, and so has *Socrates*, whom yet you will not deny to be an *Eminent Witness* for it; and as this Omission in one of *Socrates's* Copies is no Exception against his *Testimony* in favour of the Clause, so in the Case of *Gelasius*, we have all *the Assurance* Imaginable, that he believed and knew *the Clause* to be *Genuine*, and consequently, that it Originally was and still ought to be in this Copy; since he does not only retain it in his Copy of *Eusebius's Letter*, but also expressly says in the Chapter next before this Copy of the Creed, that the Council *did condemn the Term Created*, and gives us a Copy of the Synodical Epistle in which the whole Council say so too.

XIX. I HAVE now examined all your First List of *Witnesses*; but there are two Supernumeraries behind, added in your Second Edition, as a Reserve to bring up the Rear, and support the former.

The

The first of them is the Author of *the Book ascrib'd to Jerom, and intit'led, an Explanation of the Faith to Cyril*, who, you say, *begins with the Nicene Creed and its Anathema's; but intirely omits the Clause before us.* But, why *the Book ascrib'd to Jerom?* At this Rate we shall have your *Memorial*, and even your *Supposal*, dignified with the Title of *Books*; For they are *Half Sheets*, and this is not so much. And if *The Supposal* succeeds in its Pretensions to this Honourable Appellation, there are many other Political Papers ready to put in their Claims, and the Author of a *Book in folio intit'led the London Gazette* will be a very handsome Periphrasis for that Vulgar Name, *the Gazetteer*. But Gratitude is a very Good Principle, and the Merit of Contributing any thing to *the Conviction of Athanasius* is so very Great, it seems, that this Piti-ful Forger, purely for giving us a False and Imperfect Copy of *the Nicene Creed*, must be Complimented with the Style and Title of an Author of a *Book*; though you had made your Favourite Author a much better Compliment, if you had denied that he ever designed to give us a True Copy of that Creed. For in the first Place he inserts the word *Nostrum* after *Dominum*, which almost all the other Copies reject. 2. After *Filium* he reads

reads *ejus* instead of *Dei*, in opposition to all the other Copies. 3. Betwixt *substantia* and *Patris* he inserts *Dei*, which no other Copy acknowledges. 4. He omits the word *sex Patre Unigenitum*, which are retained in all the other Copies but one or two. 5. He puts ὁμοῦσον in a wrong Place, and inserts *sicut Haeretici dicunt* instead of it, in the place where it ought to stand. 6. After *per quem omnia* he inserts the words *visibilia & invisibilia*, which we find no where else, but in *the Exposition of the Creed*, and one of the *Creeds like the Nicene* in *Epiphanius*. 7. He omits the word *propter* before *nostram*, omitted in no other Copy but one. 8. He omits the Article of our Blessed Saviour's Descent from Heaven, expressed in the word *Descendit*, which is unanimously retained in all the other Copies. 9. After *Spiritum Sanctum*, he adds, *Qui de Patre processit proprie & Deus est Verus sicut Filius*. 10. In the Anathematisms after *non erat* he adds *Filius Natus*, contrary to all the other Copies. 11. After *factus sit* he adds *aut natus sit*, without the Concurrence of any other Copy. 12. He omits *vel ex alia substantia aut essentia*, the Clause immediately preceding *that in Dispute*. And besides all these, and some other Variations of less Consequence, he omits no less than 12 other Words, which are *ex-*
tant

tant in your own *True Copy*. This *Witness* therefore I take the Freedom to set aside as Perfectly Useless and Insignificant. And so far I find your *Improvements* have kept up to the Specimen you gave in the Case of *St. Ambrose*, or indeed rather exceeded it. One more only remains to be considered, and that is *the Testimony* of *Vigilius Thapsitanus*. Let us hear therefore what he has to say.

XX. *VIGILIUS THAPSITANUS*, the Probable Author of the *Athanasian Creed*, in his Account of a Pretended Disputation of *Athanasius* and *Arius* before *Probus* as a Judge, which is printed after two Editions among the *Spurious Works* of *Athanasius*, sets down the *Nicene Creed* and *Anathemas*; but has not in either Edition any Sign of this Clause.

VIGILIUS Thapsitanus, the Probable Author of the *Athanasian Creed*! You seem to have wonderfully abated of your Assurance in this matter. You could formerly speak of it, as of a thing Certain and Undeniable, and abuse poor *Vigilius* upon it, as readily as if you had stood by him whilst he was writing this *Impious* and *Antichristian Creed*. Since that, you may perhaps have met with the *Diatribes* at the End of the *Benedictin* Edition of *Athanasius*, or some other such Treatise, and learnt that the Author of this *Creed* is not so well known as is generally

nerally Imagined. But what does *the Athanasian Creed signify to the Point in Question?* What occasion was there for *the Insertion of this Clause?* That it was added with no Design at all, cannot be supposed of so Accurate a Writer, in a *Demonstration* so closely and Mathematically managed, and concluded with the Usual Sign of Triumph, Q. E. D. And to shew your Learning it could not be written; since nothing is more known than that, in the Opinion of some Learned Men, *Vigilius was Probably the Author of the Athanasian Creed.* The only Account therefore, which can be given of it, is, that it was inserted in order to add Strength to *Vigilius's Testimony.* And all the Strength it can possibly add is no more than this: *Vigilius was Probably the Author of the Athanasian Creed,* and therefore *Probably* very Orthodox; and consequently we can not reasonably suppose, that he would have omitted this Clause, if he had known it to be Genuin. Now this either may reasonably be supposed of your other *Witnesses*, or it may not. If it may not, where is the Additional Strength which *Vigilius's Testimony* receives from this *Probability?* If you will allow that it may be reasonably supposed of your other *Witnesses*, then I confess you have added Strength to the *Testimony of Vigilius,* but so very Profusely,

fusely, that you have left none for the
 rest of your *Witnesses*; for if it may be
 reasonably supposed that they would have
 omitted this Clause, though they had
 known it to be Genuin, it is not very
 Reasonable to suppose it Spurious, because
 they have omitted it. And indeed, this
Probability is so far from giving *Vigilius*
 any Advantage above your other *Witnesses*,
 that if this be all you have to say for him,
 every one of them, except *Eusebius* and
Cyrill of Jerusalem, will be more *Eminent*
 and *Substantial* than he can pretend to be
 upon the Strength of his *Probable Title*
 to the *Athanasian Creed*. For all the rest
 were most Certainly as Zealously and
 Notoriously Orthodox as the *Author of*
 the *Athanasian Creed*, whoever he was.
 And the Only Principle, which can give
Vigilius any Preference above your other
Witnesses, from the *Probability* of his be-
 ing the *Author of this Creed*, is, that the
 more Notoriously Orthodox any Writer
 was, he is for that reason the more *Authen-
 tick Witness* against the *Disputed*
Clause. Since therefore they were all as
 Certainly Orthodox as *Vigilius* was *Pro-
 bably* so upon the Supposition of his be-
 ing the *Probable Author of this Creed*,
 that Supposition gives him no other Right
 to be believed in this Case, but what your
 other *Witnesses* have in a greater Degree
 with-

without it, nay no other than what he himself has also in a much Greater Degree from those Writings which are known and acknowledged to be his. But to leave this Odd Parenthesis, and come nearer to your main Point;

VIGILIUS, it is true, in his Account of a Pretended Disputation of Athanasius and Arius, sets down the Nicene Creed and Anathemas without this Clause. But then I observe, that in the first place he inserts the word *Nostrum* after *Dominum*, which is manifestly Spurious, and acknowledged by none of the other Copies, but two or three, and those very Faulty. 2. He omits the words *propter nos homines* &c, retained in almost all the other Copies. 3. He omits &c before *resurrexit*, which is omitted only in three other notoriously Imperfect Copies. 4. In the Anathemas he omits *factus est*, after *non extantibus*, omitted in no other Copy. 5. He omits *esse* after *dicentes*, the word which ought to stand immediately before the Disputed Clause. 6. Instead of *Dei Filium* he reads *Deum* with one of Hilary's Copies, contrary to all the other, and even to Common Sense; Besides several other Variations from your True Copy. And it is farther Observable, that the Copy in *Vigilius's* Second Improved Edition of this Disputation differs from this in no less than Six several

P

Places.

Places. To which I shall only add at present, that *Vigilius* in his Book *De Unitate Trinitatis*, under the name of St. *Austin*, has two Passages which, when laid together, may perhaps be allowed to afford room for a very Probable Conjecture, that he knew the Council of *Nice* had Anathematized this Expression. The Book is written in the way of Dialogue, and not far from the Beginning of it, he brings in *Felicianus* the *Arian* expressing himself thus. *Quoniam me disputandi arte concludis, id quod a majoribus nostris dictum est, breviter explicabo. Aiunt enim, quoties de Initio Filii, & Patris Aeternitate tractatur: Erat quando non erat, & Antequam nasceretur non erat* *. And within a Page or two, the same *Felicianus* says: *Quoniam me ad ejusmodi confessionem necessitate compellis, id quod a majoribus nostris dici assolet, non tacebo. Aiunt enim, Creaturam esse Filium, sed Perfectam, & quae dominari possit omnibus Creaturis* †. I content my self barely to suggest this Argument, partly because it is Obvious enough in all the Force I pretend to give it, and partly because I am determined to wave this and the other Objections I have made, so far as to allow *Vigilius* a place in the List of your *Witnesses*, since he is the Last, and

* Op. Vigil. p. 335. Ed. Chiffi. † Ib. p. 338.

the Poll of your Side at an End, that we may enter upon the Scrutiny in good humour: but I cannot be so Complaisant as to allow him to be a *very Valuable Witness*, on the Contrary I must still *Insist upon* these Objections so far as they prove, which I think they fully do, that his *Testimony* is very Uncertain and Precarious.

AND now, Sir, to sum up your Evidence, and enter into the Merits of the Cause; Four of your Twenty *Witnesses*, *Eusebius, Ambrose, Cyrill of Alexandria, and Gelasius*, are plainly against you; Four others, *Cyrill of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, The Author of the Exposition, and the Author of the Book De Fide*, have nothing to say in this Controversy; Four more (*viz.*) *the Constantinopolitan Copy, the Alexandrian Copy, the Council of Ephesus, and the Explanation of the Faith*, have been set aside upon just and sure Grounds. To these I shall only add *St. Basil*, who has been proved to be, at least, no *Witness against the Clause*; and I believe I might have reckoned him amongst the *Witnesses* for it, and opposed him to almost any One of yours, without any Danger of being thought to have laid too Great a Stress upon the Words which follow his Copy of the Creed. There are still Seven *Witnesses* left you, for your Comfort: but against every one of these too some very just Ex-

ception has been made, and all of them have been proved to deserve very Little Credit in this Case from the False *Testimony* they so frequently give in others; from the Great want of Care and Accuracy in their Depositions; from their Inconsistency with one another, and sometimes with themselves; or such Particular Arguments as give us Grounds to believe, that if their *Testimony* had been delivered down to us uncorrupted, it would have been for the Advantage of *the Clause*. On the other side appear already *Eusebius, Athanasius, Ambrose, Cyrill of Alexandria, Socrates, and Gelasius Cyzicenus*; and against these there lies no other Exception, but that *Socrates and Gelasius* were *Famous Transcribers from and Followers of Athanasius*, which has been largely answered. In order therefore to determine whether *the Disputed Clause* be Genuin or Spurious, it remains to be considered, whether those who omit it are to be believed, according to your Opinion, for which the only Reason you have given is their Number; or those who acknowledge it, as I think, for which my Reasons are as follows.

I. THERE are more *Witnesses* for *the Clause*, than against it. For besides the Six I have mentioned already, in Opposition to your Seven,

(1.) WE have the Direct and Express
Testi-

Testimony of the whole Council of *Nice* it self, in their *Synodical Epistle*, that they did *condemn the Term Created*, as I shall prove to you at large before I conclude.

(2.) *EUGENIUS*, in his *Apology for Marcellus*, written and presented to *Athanasius* in the Name and by the Authority of the whole Church of *Ancyra*, declares as much in the following words: Ἡμεῖς τοίνυν θεωρηγυμνῶς ἀναθεματίζομεν τὴν ἀρειανὴν αἵρεσιν· πιστεύομεν δὲ, ὡς οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ὁμολόγησαν ἐν τῇ χτ' ἱερατικῇ συνόδῳ, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸ υἱόν, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ μήτε ΚΤΙΣΜΑ μήτε ποίημα εἶναι αὐτόν *.

(3.) *THEODORIT* gives us no Copy of his own: but since he commends, and inserts into his History, *Athanasius's* Epistle to *Jovian*, and in it the Creed *with the Clause before us*, for the Benefit of his Readers †; I think that Insertion and Approbation may fairly be reckoned a *Testimony* in favour of the Clause. For he could not have done this if he had known it to be Spurious, which yet, if it had been so, he cannot, without the greatest Absurdity, be supposed not to have known; coming to the writing of his History with the Confessed Advantage of so many Original Records and other Papers, besides the Qualifica-

* Ap. Montfauc. Coll. Nov. Tom. 2. p. 2.

† Ἐνθίσω δὲ ἐ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὴν ἣν ἐν πολεμικῇ ἀποστολῇ αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν. Theod. H. E. l. iv. c. 2. p. 152.

tions of *Diligence and Faithfulness* in a Greater Degree, as you pretend, than the other Ecclesiastical Historians. And indeed, if *the Council of Nice* had avoided *the Condemnation of the Term Created*, it is next to Impossible, that not only *Theodorit*, but even almost any other Bishop, could be Ignorant of a thing so very Remarkable in it self, and which must necessarily have been kept in Constant Remembrance by the Use which *the Arians* would have made of it in all their Disputes with the Orthodox.

(4.) *NAZIANZEN*, though he also gives us no Copy of *the Nicene Creed*, may yet upon the same account, very justly be thought a more *Substantial Witness* for *the Clause*, than several of yours against it; since he is so very Lavish in the praise of *Athanasius's* Epistle to *Jovian*, and calls it a *Magnificent and Royal Present* *: And as he was too Good a Man to have done this, if he had known that so Base a Cheat was *Propagated* in that Epistle; so he was too well acquainted with the *Arian Controversy*, to be supposed not Capable of Discovering this *Notorious Forgery*, which could not easily escape the Observation of any Christian, who had so much as heard of *the Council of Nice*, and its Decrees.

(5.) *FACUNDUS*, a very Learned

* Δῶρον βασιλικὸν ὄντως ἔμεγαλοπρεπές. Orat. XXI. p. 394.

Bishop, though a little Later than your Period, in his Tenth Book *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum* has the following Passage*: *Quid est autem quod in illo inexcusabile jam invenerant, si in Dionysio potuit excusari, quod Facturam esse dicit Filium Dei, & extraneum ab Essentia Patris, & quia non erat antequam fieret; cum Patres apud Nicaeam Anathematizaverint eos qui dicunt, erat quando non erat, & antequam nasceretur non erat, & qui dicunt Factum vel ex alia essentia esse Filium Dei?* Here, where he says that the word *factum* was *anathematized*, I will not positively affirm that he refers to *the Clause in Dispute*; though there may be some Probable Reasons given for it, and his Translations from the Greek, if he made them himself, are not always so very Accurate as to give us reason to conclude, that he could not render *κτὸν* by *factum*. However, I cannot doubt but this will be allowed to be every way as Clear and Satisfactory a *Testimony* in favour of *the Clause*, as that which you have drawn against it, from the Copy of *the Nicene Creed in the Acts of the Council of Carthage*.

(6.) SINCE I am come down below your Period, I shall just mention one Author more, and that is *Nicephorus*, the Ecclesiastical Historian, who undertakes

* Inter Op. Sirmond. T. 2. col. 737.

to give us a very Exact Copy of the *Nicene Creed and Anathemas*, ἐπὶ λέξεως, as he says, in which the *Disputed Clause* stands in its proper Place. *Nicephorus's Testimony* is not Antient enough, I confess, to be of any very Great Weight in this Case: but then it ought to be considered on the other hand, as some Compensation for his Deficiency in the point of Age, that as an Ecclesiastical Historian, whose business it was in a Particular Manner to search for *Original Records*, and to make the Nicest Enquiry into these matters, he must upon that account be much more Likely to furnish us with a true Copy of this Creed, than any other Author *caeteris paribus*. And this Presumption is confirmed by the Correspondence of the Fact; for it will soon appear, upon the Collation, that *Nicephorus's* Copy is more Accurate than many of those which we have from Writers of Greater Antiquity and Reputation.

BUT I am under no Necessity of going lower than the *Fifth Century* to seek for *Witnesses*, and without any Assistance from *Facundus* or *Nicephorus*, I might safely put the Issue of the Cause upon the Poll, which you so earnestly desire in your Disputes with the Orthodox; opposing to your Seven *Witnesses*, the Contrary Attestations of *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, *Theodorit*, *Socrates*, *Cyrill of Alexandria*, *Ambrose*,
Nazian-

Nazianzen, the Church of *Ancyra*, *Athanasius*, *Eusebius*, and the Council of *Nice*. But this Advantage is what I least insist upon. A Critick will not be determined to a Reading from the Number, but the Goodness, of his MSS; neither will a Judge decide a Cause upon the Majority, so much as the Credibility of the *Witnesses*. Let us therefore consider the several Writers in both these Views.

II. IF we consider them as so many MSS, some of which retain, and others omit, a Word or *Clause*, which may be either retained or omitted without any Damage to the Sense and Construction; In that case a Critick would enquire, which of his Copies were taken nearest the Original, which the most Antient, and most Exact. As to the two first of these Advantages, I presume, there can be no Dispute; since *Eusebius*, and *Athanasius* are not only the most Antient, but also the only Persons who were present at the Council. But as Antiquity in a MS seems to be therefore chiefly Valuable, because the more Antient it is, the fewer Transcriptions are likely to have passed betwixt it and the Original; so the Advantage of coming nearest the Original depends upon the Probability of its being upon that account the more Exact: The Exactness of a MS therefore is what gives it the Greatest Authority,

thority, and in this Respect the Copies which want *the Clause* cannot stand the least Comparison; all of them abounding with Faults and Variations from one another, and most of them omitting many other Words as well as those *beforeus*.

III. IF we consider them as so many *Witnesses*, attesting or not attesting to a Matter of Fact, *Eusebius* and *Athanasius*, and they only, were upon the Place where the thing is pretended to have been done; if others therefore possibly might, They could not possibly be Ignorant whether it was done or not.

IV. WE have this farther Advantage in the *Evidence* which *Athanasius* gives in favour of *the Clause*, that He is attended by His Suffragan Bishops, and His *Testimony* Confirmed by Their Concurrence; His Epistle to *Jovian* being written in the Name of an Assembly of Bishops, and those the Representatives of all the Bishops of *Aegypt* and *Lybia*, as the Direction plainly intimates *, upon which account *Theodorit* gives it the Title of a *Synodical Epistle*. Here it may perhaps be Objected, that *Athanasius* cannot be a *Witness* in His own Cause; to which I reply (though His Cause will easily support it self without any Assistance from His Testi-

* Ἀθανάσιος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ ἐλθόντες ἐκ περιστάσεως πάντων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰγύπτου καὶ θηβαΐδος καὶ λιβύων ἐπισκόπων.
Ap. Theod. E. H. l. iv. c. 3. p. 152.

mony) that in Judicial Causes, where the Person accused hears his Charge, his Denial of the Fact is justly esteemed no Proof of his Innocence, as being supposed Necessary for his Defense: but here the Case is widely different, where your Interesting *Athanasius's Integrity* in a Point of Criticism, to be decided by the Number and Value of the Copies, and other Proper Critical Arguments, ought not to set aside the Authority of His Copies. And as you put the Issue of the Dispute, whether the Clause be Genuin or not, upon the Number of Copies; that Question must first be Determined, and in order to it all the Copies extant must be taken into the Account, before we can pretend to enquire into the Origin of the Omission or Interpolation. The Interpolation must first be proved to have been made by some body, before any body can be charged with it; The Reading must first be proved Spurious, before the Transcriber of any Copy in which it is, can be accused of inserting it, and his Testimony excluded upon that Accusation.

V. *AMBROSE's Testimony* is in this Dispute Equivalent to a great many others, not so much because it is more Antient than the Greatest Part of your *Evidence*, as because *the Words before us* are slipt out of his Copy, whilst his Comment plainly shews that they ought to be there,

there, and Originally were so. Upon this account, I say, he is a more *Substantial Witness*, than if the Clause had been preserved in his Copy of *the Anathemas*, without any Comment upon them. In that case it might possibly have been said, that the Words were inserted after his time by some *Athanasian*, which Evasion is now entirely prevented: Neither can it be said, that some *Athanasian* has Interpolated his Comment; for that no man in his Senses would do, without Interpolating the Text.

VI. ALL the *Witnesses* for the *Disputed Clause* have several Advantages in common over yours against it. One of these, and not the Least, is the Different Nature of their *Testimonies*. It is a standing Rule, that one Positive *Witness* is Equal to two Negative: and yet as little weight as Negative *Witnesses* have when opposed to Positive, you cannot pretend to so much as one, who directly denies, that *the Council condemned the Term Created*; whereas, besides the Positive Evidence in the Copies which retain the Clause, we have *Witnesses* who directly affirm, that *the Council did Condemn that Term*.

VII. ANOTHER General Advantage is, that these Positive *Witnesses* agree as much as can Possibly be expected; yours on the contrary differ so much, and often so materially, from one another, that *no man-*
ner

ner of Dependance can be had upon them. Particularly almost all the Copies in the Acts of the Councils are so mangled and Corrupted, and have so Numerous and so Considerable Variations from the other Copies and from one another, that they may justly be thought the most Insignificant Part of your Authorities. And it is farther Observable, that Most of your *Witnesses* give their *Evidence* against several Indisputably Genuin Words in the Creed and *Anathemas*, as positively as against these two *before us*; and have therefore forfeited all right to be believed in the Present Case, by the Falsehood of their *Testimony* in others.

VIII. THE Remarkable Omissions and Variations in the Copies, which have not this Clause, about the Place where it should stand, afford us a very Probable Argument for it. Several Copies omit the word before it, some the two words before it, others invert the Order of the following words; Many, with *your True Copy*, omit η before $\tauρεπλον$, and so make a manifest *Hiatus* in the Period. This *Chasm* and the other Variations plainly shew, that there has been either a little Foul Play, or a Great Deal of Negligence hereabouts; and are much rather the Footsteps of an *Arian* or *Semiarian* Corrupter, than of an *Athanasian Interpolator*.
BUT

BUT it may perhaps deserve to be considered whether the Particle ἡ before *τρεπλὸν* be Genuin or Spurious. That it is Genuin I think is very clear from the following Reasons. 1. Without it the Course and Connexion of the Sentence is interrupted and broken, as I have already observed. 2. It is retained in no less than fifteen of those Copies which want *the Disputed Clause*, where no *Athanasian Forgery* can possibly be suspected. 3. Even you, who believe ἡ *κπιτὸν* to be an *Interpolation* of *Athanasius's*, must, in Consequence of that Supposition, allow it to be highly Probable, that the Conjunction ἡ before *τρεπλὸν* is Genuin; for if the Council had wrote — *Φάσκοντες εἶναι, τρεπλὸν ἡ ἀλλοιωτὸν*, the Interpolator would most certainly have been content with the addition of the word *κπιτὸν*, and not have altered the Connection and Construction of the Period by the addition of another word, which must necessarily make his *Interpolation* more Easy to be Detected. I set it down therefore, as a thing Certain and not to be denied by any man who is not so absurd as to require Mathematical Demonstration in a Dispute about a Various Reading, that ἡ before *τρεπλὸν* is Genuin. And hence it follows, that very nigh half your Copies besides their other faults, are Corrupted and Imperfect in the
very

very place where *the Disputed Clause* ought to stand; and consequently, that they cannot furnish us with a satisfactory Argument against it, but rather on the Contrary give us Grounds to suspect, that something else has been *omitted* as well as this Particle.

IX. THERE is also this Internal Character in favour of *the Disputed Clause*, that the Expression condemned in it was the Principal Blasphemy of *Arius*, and indeed the Source of all the rest, and in a Peculiar manner of the words which immediately follow *κτιστὸν* in *the Anathemas*, *τρεπλὸν* and *ἀλλοιωτὸν* *, as we learn from several Writers, and particularly from *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria* in his Letter to the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and from the Words of the first *Arians* themselves given us by the same *Alexander* in his other Epistle, directed to all the Bishops of the Catholick Church. And it is highly Improbable, that they would spare That,

* Συναναλαμβάνοντες τῇ τ' ἀπάντων κτίσθ' καὶ τ' υἱὸν τῷ Θεῷ οἷς ἀκολούθως ἔφασιν αὐτὸν τρεπλῆς εἶναι φύσεως. Alexand. Epist. ad Alex. Constantinopolitanum ap. Theod. E. H. l. 1. c. 4. ἀλλ' εἰς μὲν τ' ποιημάτων ἔ' μνητῶν ἐστὶ — διὸ καὶ τρεπλὸς ἐστὶ καὶ ἀλλοιωτὸς τὴν φύσιν. — τρεπλῆς ᾧ φύσεως ἐστὶ, μνητὸς ἔ' τρεπλὸς (l. κτιστὸς) ὑπάρχων. Verba Arii suorumque in Epist. Ejusd. Alex. ad omni. Episc. ap. Soc. l. 1. c. 6. ἔ'θιν αὐτὰ ἢ εἰσαγωγὴ τ' πλάνης γενέσθ'. — ἀπὸ τῷ ἐνὸς τέττε λόγῳ εἰς πολλὰς ἔ' κακὰς τελείας ἐλάσας. κ. τ. λ. Epiph. H. 69. p. 736. ἐκ ταύτης ἐν τ' λίζεως — λοιπὸν τὰ πάντα αὐτῆς ἐπινοεῖται. Id. ib. p. 738.

and condemn these, which are only Consequences of it, and Expositions and Illustrations of that Original Errour. And indeed it is scarce Probable that they would have thought of condemning these two words, if the word *κτὸν* going before had not put them in mind of the Conclusion which *the Arians* drew from it; especially since they omitted other more Considerable Expressions used by *Arius* and his Followers.

TO this I foresee it may be replied, "That
 "the *Nicene* Fathers were too Good Men,
 "to Condemn an Expression used in Scrip-
 "ture; and that it is a Stronger Presump-
 "tion that they did not condemn it, because
 "it was applied to our Saviour in Scripture;
 "than that they did condemn it, because it
 "was applied to Him by *Arius*. This there-
 "fore may be thought an Answer to the
 "Former Argument for *the Clause*, and at
 "the same time an Internal Character against
 "it. But this Objection, as much as it
 promises, proves Nothing by Proving too
 much. For if it concludes rightly against
the Clause before us, it must necessarily
 conclude much more strongly against &
ποιηθέντα, an Undisputed Clause extant in
 all the Copies of the Creed; that word
 being plainly used of our Saviour more
 than once in the New Testament, whereas
 the word *Created* is no where used of
 Him,

Him, but in a False Translation of a Figurative Part of the Old Testament. *The Nicene Fathers* in this Case shewed themselves more Sollicitous for the Sense than the Words of Scripture, and that very Wisely and Piously; since Scripture Phrases may be, and too often have been, so wrested and perverted, as to express the most horrid Blasphemies. *The Anthropomorphites* had most certainly the Words of Scripture on their Side; but would any man therefore Scruple to say that God is of an Incorporeal and Immaterial Nature, and has neither *Head*, nor *Face*, nor *Eyes*, nor *Ears*, nor *Hands*, nor *Fingers*, nor any other of the Parts of Human Bodies, which are Figuratively ascribed to Him in Scripture? There are many Expressions used of our Blessed Saviour in Scripture either Figuratively, or οἰκονομικῶς, with respect to his Incarnation and Humanity, which cannot without the greatest Blasphemy be Dogmatically affirmed of the SON OF GOD in His Divine Nature; and would any Council be afraid to anathematize those who could be so Impious and Absurd as to assert, and there have been Hereticks who have maintained Notions not less Impious and Absurd, that Our Blessed Saviour was Really and Properly a *Lamb*, a *Servant*, a *Stone*, a *Star*, a *Tree*, a *Well*, or a *Worm* as he is called

Psalm. xxii. 6. according to *St. Jerom*, and many other Writers? We have seen Hereticks, and I am afraid we see them every day, who deny the Divine Foreknowledge of Human Actions; and should any of these, amongst the many Monstrous Absurdities which they run into for fear of believing any thing against Reason, deny that God knows any thing, and make Ignorance one of His Attributes; would it be Unlawful to condemn this Blasphemy, because τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the Foolishness of GOD*, is an Expression used in Scripture? But I am not at present concerned to Defend the Council of *Nice* in the Regard they have shewn to the Doctrine of the Inspired Writers, above their Expressions: it is sufficient for my purpose that this was really the Case; and that it was so, is plain from the Clause ὃ ποιηθέντα.

X. THE Omission of this Clause, upon the Supposition that it is Genuin, is much more Easy to be accounted for, than the Interpolation, upon the Supposition that it is Spurious; whether we suppose the Omission or Interpolation to have been Voluntary or Accidental. In the last Case this is Universally true; a Careless and Hasty Transcriber being much more likely to leave out a word, than to insert one. This, I say, is True in the General Notion; and with respect to the Present Omission

Omission or Interpolation, it is farther Probable from the Negligence of most Ecclesiastical Writers, who seem to quote Scripture and Creeds from their Memory only. It is also farther Probable from the Great Number of other Omissions in the Copies of *the Anathemas*, which are almost as Numerous as in the Creed it self; and particularly from the Omissions and Variations about the Place where the Clause should stand, as I have already observed. And besides these Probabilities, *Eusebius, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Socrates, and Gelasius* assure us, what *Basil and Rufinus* gave us Grounds to Suspect, that the Clause has been dropt out of some Copies where it Originally was; there cannot therefore be any Farther Dispute as to this Point, till you can prove, that it has been inserted into some Copies where it Originally was not.

IT may be said perhaps, that allowing this to be True, though it has certainly been dropt out of some Copies, it is yet very Strange and Unaccountable, that it should be wanting in so many. But against a Reading established by Proper Critical Arguments, and all the Proofs which the Nature of the thing will bear, it is Ridiculous to Object, that many MSS do not acknowledge it; and still more Ridiculous to Expect a Certain Account how it came to be omitted in those MSS.

Why should it be so Strange a thing, that this Clause should be wanting in many Copies, and yet no Wonder at all, but the Commonest thing in the World, that the True Reading should be found in the fewest Copies? And to give one Instance out of a Thousand which might be brought, Why is this Stranger than that the Doxology at the End of the Lord's Prayer should be omitted in so many of *St. Matthew's* Copies, or the Eleven first Verses of *St. John's* Eighth Chapter in so many of His Manuscripts? It would have been a little Strange indeed, if all the Copies of the Creed had been of the same Age, and Transcribed from one and the same Copy: but as the Case now stands, the Wonder ceases; since an Omission once made in one or two Copies, might easily spread it self into a great many more. And after all, this Objection bears as hard, nay much harder, upon the other Side; since some of *the Witnesses* I have produced, expressly say, that the Word *Created* was Condemned, and Consequently that the Disputed Clause is an *Authentick* Part of *the Anathemas*; whereas your *Witnesses* are only Copies without the Clause: And as it is at least as hard to account for the Omission of it in those which have it not, whilst we suppose it Genuin, as for the Insertion of it in those which have it, whilst

whilst we suppose it Spurious; so it is manifestly much more Easy to account for the Omission of a Genuin Clause in many Copies, than the Plain Attestations of a Few *Witnesses* to a Spurious Clause.

XI. IF this Interpolation or Omission must not be thought the Effect of Chance, but a Piece of *Athanasian* or *Arian* Knavery, even in that case the Corruption of the *Anathemas* may with much better Reason be charged upon some *Arian*, than upon *Athanasius*. We have assurance enough, that there were men amongst the *Arians*, who would not stick at such a thing as this to serve their Cause; and that too when the Service they Intended was less, if it be possible, than casting this Clause out of the *Anathemas*. Witness those Honest Bishops, who met in Council at *Nice* in *Thrace*, where they Translated a Creed of their own into Greek, and gave it out to be the Creed of the General Council, which was held at *Nice* in *Bit-hynia*; hoping to deceive the Vulgar, τῷ παραπλησίῳ τῷ ὀνομάτῳ, by the Similitude of the Words Νίκη and Νικαία *. And we learn from *Sulpicius* † and others, that some of them corrupted the Creed by turning ὁμοῖσις into ὁμοῖσιος. Those therefore, who Counterfeited and Corrupted the Creed,

* Soz. l. iv. c. 19. p. 462.

† L. ii. c. 40. p. 265.

may with some Reason be *suspected* of Corrupting the *Anathemas*; where the Crime was not Greater, and the Detection much more difficult: But what reason have we to believe any thing like this of *Athanasius*? Is there any Example in History of any such *Forgery* of His, to support the Probability of this Imputation? Does His *General Character* give us any Grounds to think Him a Man Capable of doing or approving of so Villainous an Action?

BUT setting aside the Consideration of His *Integrity*, which is as Notorious as His Sufferings for it, there is yet another Question to be asked, and that a very Equitable one, *Cui bono*? What advantage could He possibly propose to Himself or His Cause, by adding a Word, which either meant nothing at all, or was already condemned in the Expressions which go before it in all the Copies of the *Anathemas*? Suppose the word was not at this Day extant in any one Copy of those *Anathemas*, could the *Athanasians* have any great Reason to wish it there? Would they find any Want of it, whilst in the Creed it self our Saviour is said to be *Very God of very God, Begotten not MADE, of one Substance with the Father*; and whilst those are *Anathematized*, who presume to say *He was made out of nothing*, or that *there was a Duration when He*
was

was not ? And if there would be little want of it now, there was rather less then, when the more Moderate *Arians* took care to avoid that Expression; and of this we have a very Remarkable Instance in the Emperor *Constantius*, who would never endure to hear it, as *Theodorit* often assures us, and expressly commanded the Followers of *Eudoxius* to condemn it, and *anathematize* those who used it. Now if *Athanasius* did endeavour to make People believe, that the word *Created* was Condemned by the Council of *Nice*, he must do it either with no Design at all, which cannot be supposed of any man in his Senses, or with a Design to deterr them from affirming that our Saviour was *Created*. But He could not *Forge* this with a Design to deterr the Orthodox from affirming what even the more Moderate *Arians* abhorred, nor yet with a Design to stop the Mouths of the more Violent *Arians* by the Authority of a Council which they contemned and defied. On the other hand, if there were any Persons, who believed our Saviour to be *Uncreated*, and that the word *κτίζεν* in the *Proverbs* meant nothing more than Production, and yet might be so Scrupulous as not to like the Condemnation of a word used in Scripture, though in another

ther Sense than that in which it was Condemned; these Men must, in all Probability, be offended and prejudiced against the Council upon that account. *Athanasius* therefore could not but expect more Disadvantage than Advantage to the Cause of Orthodoxy from this Interpolation. And to do so Vile an Action in these Circumstances, and upon such Motives, is so Senseless a Piece of *Villainy*, that No Man ought to be thought Capable of Doing it, but he who can suppose it of Another.

BESIDES, if it be *Certain that the Council of Nice did not insert the Word Created into these Anathemas*, could *Athanasius* have the least Grounds to hope, that His *Forgery* would not be Discovered, at so small a Distance of Time, when there were so many True Copies extant, and in the hands of those who were Continually watching an Opportunity to ruin Him? Must it not Necessarily have been the most Notorious Thing in the World, that this Famous Orthodox Council *durst not* condemn the Principal Blasphemy of *Arius*? Would not *the Arians* keep up the Remembrance of it, by continually pressing it upon their Adversaries? Was it possible for *Athanasius* to hope, that, though His Interpolated Copies should have the Good Fortune to escape Unobserved for some time, His Books, in which
he

he several times directly affirms that the Council of Nice did condemn that word, could fall into the hands of any Arian, who would not be able to give Him the Lye upon his own Certain Knowledge, if he was the least acquainted with the Controversy? And would a Man of His *Admirable Parts* and Sense propagate an *Interpolation* for the Interest of His Cause, which could not but be Detected immediately to the Irreparable Damage and Disgrace of Himself and His Cause; and which yet, if it should escape Detection, would be of no Service to Himself or His Cause, but rather the contrary? Or if He could be so Stupidly Wicked Himself, as to Damn Himself with Deliberation for nothing; could He work up an Assembly of Bishops to the same Height of Wickedness and Stupidity?

AND farther, whatever you may think of *Athanasius's* Heat and Obstinacy, which were nothing but Zeal and Constancy; He has sufficiently shewn Himself a Man of truly *Moderate* and *Comprehensive Principles* in the Disputes which arose among the Orthodox about ὁσία and ὑπόστασις, and in the Declaration He makes in favour of those who could not approve of the Word ὁμοούσιος *. It is therefore In-

* De Synodis p. 755.

consistent with His Character, to suppose that He would *Interpolate the Anathemas* to bring in a word, which, as I have already observed, could not gain over one *Arian* to His side, and might Probably give Occasion of Scandal and Disgust to several who would otherwise have joyned with Him.

TO this I shall only add, that you have brought an Argument to prove, that *Athanasius* made this *Interpolation Voluntarily*, which, in my Opinion, rather proves that He made no *Interpolation* at all. Your Argument is this: *Athanasius's very Church of Alexandria's Copy had not this Interpolation, as we have seen; so that it is morally certain, that Athanasius was not unacquainted with the True Copy, and so certain, that this Interpolation of His was Voluntary.* But if *Athanasius* did not *Interpolate* that Copy which of all others He was most likely to have *Interpolated*, I think we may fairly conclude that He *Interpolated* none. And that He should *Interpolate* any Copy, and not that too which belonged to *His own Church*, is highly Improbable. Could He be so silly, as to leave *so Authentick a Witness* of His *Fraud* in His own Archives, where the Bishops of His Province, and the Clergy of His Diocese might so easily and almost Unavoidably discover His *Villainy*? Must He not foresee that the Consequence of such

a Discovery would be His Certain Ruin? Would He chuse to live in the Continual Danger of being Deserted by those without whose steddy Adherence He found He could not support Himself, when it was every day in His Power to ease Himself of these Terrible Apprehensions? Would not a man, whose *Ambition* it was to give *Laws to the whole World*, take all the care He could that His own Clergy and Countrymen should not Despise and Detest Him as a *Notorious Villain*? Is it not strange, that none of His Subordinate Clergy, none of his Suffragan Bishops, who had Frequent Occasions to come to *Alexandria*, and if they were Men of any Learning or Curiosity, as certainly some of them at least must have been, could not but spend some time among the Records of that Antient Church; Is it not strange, I say, that none of these should ever discover this *Forgery*? And if they did Discover it, is it not stranger, that so many of them should stand by Him so Faithfully in the Worst of Times, and venture their Lives in the Service of a *Tyrannical, Cheating Knave*? But this only concerns you, and that other *Judicious Person*, from whom you received the fixing this Interpolation upon *Athanasius*; for we have seen, that *Athanasius's* very Church of *Alexandria's* Copy had this Clause.

XII. AND now Lastly I am to make good my Promise, and Prove that the Council it self, in their *Synodical Epistle*, declare that they had Condemned the word *Created*: And if this can be Proved, every man, I think, must own, that the Case is as Clear to Him, as if he saw *the Clause* with his own Eyes in the Original *Anathemas*, which the Fathers of that Council subscribed; unless it can be supposed that the Whole Council could be Ignorant of what the Whole Council had done, or attempt to make the World believe that they had Condemned an Expression, which all the World must soon know they had not Condemned.

OF this Synodical Epistle we have four Copies extant, and those are in *Theodorit*, *Socrates*, *Gelasius*, and *Nicephorus*. In the Three Last they affirm that they have *anathematized the Term Created or Creature*. In the First the Clause where they say so is omitted, as the Greek Text now stands, but retained in all the Versions I have seen, except *Camerarius's*, and this encouraged me to consult the *Historia Tripartita*, collected and Translated from *Socrates*, *Sozomen*, and *Theodorit*, in which the Compiler transcribes sometimes one and sometimes another, Prefixing the Name of the Author from whom he Transcribes, as we are told in the Preface: *Judicavimus de singulis Dicta-*

Dictatoribus deflorata colligere, & cum Auctoris sui nomine in Ordinem collocare. And in this *History* there is a Copy of the *Synodical Epistle* with the abovementioned Clause in its proper place, as in the other Three, and *Theodorit's* Name is set before it; which, in my Opinion, is a very substantial Proof, that the Clause was in that Copy of *Theodorit* which *Epiphanius Scholasticus* made use of, about 50 Years after *Theodorit's* Death; an Age, which I believe, no *MS* of that *Author* now extant can pretend to come nigh. And if the Clause was in *Epiphanius's* Copy of *Theodorit*, I think we may very reasonably conclude, that it was Originally in that Copy of the *Synodical Epistle*, which *Theodorit* published; since it is Infinitely more Probable that it was Originally there, and afterwards dropt, in so Long a Tract of Time, and in the Course of so many Transcriptions, than that it was Originally not there, and yet inserted so very Early. What Weight this Argument will have with you in the Present Case, I cannot pretend to guess: but this I will venture to say, that in any Parallel Case of Criticism, where there is no room for Prejudice, you, and all Men of Sense, must readily agree, that the True Reading of a *Record* preserved in any History is that which the most Antient

MS of that History acknowledges, and all the other Historians in their Copies of the same *Record* unanimously retain. It appears therefore, that in all the Copies of *the Synodical Epistle* now extant there is, or Originally was, a Clause, in which the Whole Council assures us, that *the Term Created* was Condemned. And after all, if we should not insist upon *Theodorit's* Testimony, there would yet be Three Copies against One, Three Positive Witnesses against One Negative; a Disparity Great enough of it self to determine a Dispute of this Nature, where no Internal Character can be pretended on the other side. One of the Three indeed is too Modern to be of any Great Authority: but even he alone, notwithstanding this Disadvantage in the Point of Age, may be safely opposed to *Theodorit* in the Present State of the Case; since the Argument drawn from *Epiphanius's* Translation, though it should not be thought strong enough to prove *Theodorit* a Witness for this Clause in *the Synodical Epistle*, must yet, in its Least Force, be allowed to prove, that, as a Witness *against* it, his *Evidence* is very Uncertain and Precarious. And the other Two are Unexceptionable, your old Objection of *Transcribing from Athanasius* being here entirely Precluded; since *Athanasius* has no where given us any Copy of this *Epistle*.

BUT

BUT to make the Case still Clearer, if possible, I shall propose and examine all the Objections, which can be raised against this Decisive *Testimony* by the most Captious and Disingenuous Adversary. And in the first place it may perhaps be Objected, " That the word $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$ is not said to have " been anathematized, but $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$; that the " word $\pi\acute{o}\iota\eta\mu\alpha$ is joyned with it, which " yet we find in no Copy of the Anathe- " matisms; and that the words $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota\acute{o}\tau\eta\tau\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ $\chi\grave{\epsilon}$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\lambda\epsilon\chi\acute{o}\nu$ are also said " to have shared the same Fate, though " we have not one *Syllable* of them in any " Copy of the *Anathemas* now extant; " whence it necessarily follows, that the " Council did not design to give the very " words, which they had condemned, but " only the Sense; and consequently, that " the *Disputed Clause* cannot be proved " Genuin from the Insertion of the word " $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$ in this place, since it is agreed, " that all which can be meant by $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha$ " or $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$ is condemned in the other Ana- " thematized Expressions, which are allow- " ed to be Genuin. These Objections I have put together into One, because they agree in the same Particular Conclusion, and will be removed at once by the same Answer, which I shall give as briefly as I can, after I have set down the Passage from which they are drawn. Καὶ παμφηρεῖ
ἔδειξεν

ἔδοξεν ἀναθεματιθῆναι τὴν ἀσεβῆ αὐτῷ δοῦσαν, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ βλάσφημα, οἷς ἐπέχρητο βλασφημῶν, ἢ ὑπὸ τῷ Θεῷ λέγων ἔξ οὗκ ὄντων, καὶ εἶναι ποτὲ ὅτε οὗκ ἦν καὶ αὐτεξουσίᾳ κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν ἢ ὑπὸ τῷ Θεῷ λέγοντος καὶ κτίσμα καὶ ποίημα ὀνομάζοντος, ἅπαντα ἀναθεμάτισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος *. These are the Words of the Council in their Synodical Epistle, and the Question is, whether the small Inaccuracy shewn in putting κτίσμα for κτιστὸν, in placing ποίημα amongst the Anathematized Expressions, whereas it was only Condemned in the Creed, and in Paraphrasing τρεπλὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν by αὐτεξουσιότητι κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς δεκτικὸν, be sufficient to prove, that the Council meant nothing more than that they had Condemned the Sense and Notion of *the Term Created* expressed in the other Condemned Phrases. And this being the State of the Question, I am to maintain it in the Negative, which, I think, will Clearly appear to be True from the following Reasons. 1. The only Condemned Expressions omitted in this Account, which the Council gives us of their Anathematisms, are πρὸν γεννηθῆναι ἐκ ἡν, and ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, and the first of these is retained in *Theodorit's* Copy of this Epistle; and though both of them may be affirmed of any *Created* Being, yet neither of them contains any thing like the Notion and

* Ap. Soc. L. 1. c. 9. p. 23.

Definition of *Creation*. And ἡν ποτὲ ὅτε ἐκ ἡν, and ἐξ ὧν ὄντων, which do really contain the Notion of a *Created* Being, are expressly mentioned in this Account before κτίσμα. Now when the Council added the word κτίσμα after these and the other Condemned Expressions, they either meant to make their Readers believe by it, that they had condemned another word besides those which went before, or another Notion only, or this Clause is a Stupid Tautology without any Design or Meaning at all. If they meant to make their Readers believe they had condemned another word, the Point I contend for is gained, and the Contrary Argument falls to the Ground. And they could not mean to make their Readers believe they had Condemned a Notion not mentioned as Condemned before; for they had mentioned two Expressions, in which the Notion of *Creation* is fully Condemned. It remains therefore, that it is a Necessary Consequence from the Supposition against which I am arguing, that this Clause in the Synodical Epistle is a Stupid Tautology without any Design or Meaning. And as this Consequence is Absurd enough to shew the Falschood of any Assertion, from which it follows; so in the Present Case Particularly it is of Double Force against the Argument I am now Exam-

ing, which has all its Strength from the Appearance of a small Inaccuracy on the other hand, and, to avoid it, runs us into the Supposition of a Greater. 2. It is a Point agreed upon betwixt us, and Evidently True in it self, that if the Council of *Nice* did not condemn *the Term Created*, it could be for no other Reason but because they *durst not*. And if they would have anathematized it, if they *durst*; it is plain, that they did, if they *durst*. But if they *durst* call it Blasphemous, they *durst* anathematize it, and forbid the Use of it. And in this very Passage they reckon it among the τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τὰ βλάσφημα. Therefore they *durst* condemn it. Therefore they did. 3. If the Council of *Nice* did not condemn *the Term Created*, the same Principle of Conscience, which restrained them from Condemning it, must also have restrained them from speaking of it, as they do here, in such a manner, that it was not possible for them to have notified the Condemnation of it more clearly and expressly, if they really had Condemned it. And to suppose that they *durst* endeavour to make the World believe, that they had Condemned a word, which they *durst not* Condemn, is very Absurd and Inconsistent; and can only be the Last Refuge of a Perverse Disputant, who can believe an Assembly of 300 Primitive Bishops

Bishops to have been Honest and Conscientious one Minute, and *Knaves* and *Villains* the next, just as it serves his present Purpose, rather than give up a Darling Hypothesis. And if you, who have taken so much Pains sometimes to *Vindicate*, and sometimes to abuse *the Council of Nice*, can entertain this Opinion of them; I dare venture to assure you, for your Satisfaction, that you will be as Singular in it as your heart can wish.

BESIDES these, the only Objection which I think can possibly be made, is, "That of all the Anathematized Expressions *κρίσμα* is mentioned last in this Account, and after the Paraphrase of *τεπ-
τον ἢ ἀλλοιωτόν*. There is therefore little reason to doubt but this Clause in the *Synodical Epistle* is no better than *Athanasian Interpolation and Forgery also*; especially since the Period is Full and Compleat without it. But the Fullness of the Period without it is no Argument against it; for if you break off at *ἦν*, the Period is Full; if you break off higher at *βλάβοςσημα*, the Period is still Full. And the Place in which it stands can be no Argument against it, whilst the first *Arian* Expression mentioned in this Account is the third in the Anathematisms, and the first in the Anathematisms is the Second here. On the contrary, it is much

rather an Argument in its favour; for an Interpolator, if he had not as little Sense as Honesty, would most Certainly have inserted it in its proper Place.

UPON the whole matter, The Copies, in which this Clause of *the Anathemas* is omitted, are generally very Faulty, and omit many other Words as well as those *before us*, particularly in *the Anathemas*: The Copies which acknowledge it are much more Correct, more Antient, and taken at fewer Removes from the Original. *The Witnesses against it* are only those Inaccurate Copies which omit it: *The Witnesses for it* are not only the Copies which retain it, but also several Authors who Intimate, and others who directly affirm, that *the Term Created* was Condemned. *The Witnesses against it* are Negative, Fewer, more Modern, Inconsistent with one another, and often with themselves, most of them *Convicted* of giving False Evidence against other Words which are Indisputably Genuine, and not one of them present where the Scene of the Disputed Fact is laid: *The Witnesses for it* are Positive, more in number, more Antient, more *Substantial*, more *Authentick*, agree in Their Testimony, and two of them Present at the Council. For the Clause there are several Internal

ternal Characters; against it None. The Accidental Omission of it is much more Easy to be accounted for, than the Accidental Insertion of it. The *Voluntary* Omission of it may also Easily be accounted for, by Charging it upon *the Arians*, for which we have very Good Grounds from History; since they who Counterfeited and Corrupted the Creed it self, with so little Prospect of any Real Advantage to their Cause from it, and the Absolute Impossibility of escaping undiscovered, could not, upon any Principle of Conscience or Caution, scruple to corrupt *the Anathemas*: The *Voluntary* Insertion of it cannot be accounted for by charging it upon *Athanasius*, as you have done; since we have no Reason, from His Character or History, to suppose Him Capable of so Base an Action, and very Good Grounds from both to believe the Contrary; since He could not propose any Possible Advantage to Himself or His Cause from it, nor hope to deterr any man from using that Expression by this Interpolation, the *Orthodox* and Moderate *Arians* abstaining from it already, and that the more Violent *Arians* would do any thing out of Deference to the Authority of a Council they defied, no man in his Wits could Imagine; since on the contrary He had more reason to expect, that the Insertion of this

Clause would prejudice some against the Council, than reconcile any to it or its Doctrine; since a Man of His *Admirable Parts* cannot be supposed so Egregiously stupid, as to *Propagate an Interpolation* for the Interest of His Cause, which could not be of any Service to His Cause, and must also soon be Detected by His Vigilant Enemies to the Irreparable Damage and Disgrace of Himself and His Cause; and since, though all this could be supposed of *Athanasius*, yet no man can be so Uncharitable and Absurd as to suppose it of a whole Assembly of Bishops, who joyned with Him in *Propagating* this Clause, but he who could be so Foolishly Wicked, as to be guilty of such a senseless Piece of Villainy himself. And lastly, which alone, till it is Disproved, must for ever silence this Dispute, we have the Express *Testimony* of the Council it self that the *Term Created* was *Anathematized*.

AND now I think I may be allowed to say, that no Reading, which is not either Acknowledged by all the Copies, or Absolutely Necessary to the Sense and Construction, can well be established upon surer Grounds than this *Clause of the Anathemas*. Your *Second Proposition* therefore being thus so plainly refuted, the *Third*, which depends entirely upon it, must fall of Course without any farther Trouble

Trouble: and yet if you expect that This too should be *a little considered*, you may find perhaps that in one of the Observations upon your *First Proposition*, and the XIth Argument against your *Second*, I have Occasionally said enough to shew, that you have drawn a Precarious, Unnecessary, and Absurd Consequence from a False Assumption.

I am, SIR,

With all Due Respect,

Your most Humble Servant,

STYAN THIRLBY.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IT may perhaps be expected, that I should say something here of a Little Book, which was Published whilst these Papers were in the Press, with the Title of *Calumny no Conviction*, in *Answer to your Letter*. But though I cannot think my self so Base, as to be Capable of any thing like Ingratitude; I must own I find very Little Inclination in my self to pay the Acknowledgements, which I owe to the Anonymous Author of that Piece. For, to confess the Truth of the Case, that Learned Gentleman has been so very Excessive in His Civilities, that I cannot easily make a Warm and Suitable Return, without the Danger of being thought so Weak, as to be pleased with Undeserved Praise. Other men may, and will, say, The Judicious Author of *Calumny no Conviction*: but in me, it might perhaps be construed rather Vanity, than Gratitude. I must therefore leave the Commendations He so justly deserves to those, who can Commend Him with less Envy to themselves, and much more Credit to Him. But whatever Imputations I may lay my self open to by it, as I had much rather be, or be thought, Vain than Ungratefull,
I can

P O S T S C R I P T.

I cannot excuse my self from thankfully acknowledging the Great Honour, which this Ingenious Gentleman has done me. And if any man be so Sour as to think, that even by this Poor Acknowledgement I do in effect take to my self the Applause which I cannot pretend to deserve; I shall have the Satisfaction to see him shew not less Ignorance than Ill Nature, in Absurdly Concluding, that a man takes a thing as his Due, because he receives it thankfully as a Favour. In one thing indeed my Generous Advocate might have obliged me farther, and that is by publishing His Book sooner; for though He has not Anticipated me in many Points, yet it would have furnished me with a very Good Answer to the Arguments and Importunity of my Friends, which have extorted from me the foregoing unpolished Sheets. As they are, I have given them up to the Repeated Request of those, whom I ought not to have suffered to have asked any thing of me twice; and if I have obliged them at the Expence of my Reputation, I shall comfort my self, under the Loss of it, by the Principle to which I have sacrificed it. Not but that I should be glad to shew the Regard I pay to their Commands at a Cheaper Rate; a Man may be willing to venture his Life in the Service of his Friend, and

yet

P O S T S C R I P T.

yet very willing to come off Alive: And though I am not, so far as I know my self, of the Number of those who can *fatten* upon Praise, and grow *Lean* upon the Disappointment of it, I am not so Proud as to despise the Censure of *the Publick*; Neither am I ashamed to beg the Continuance of the same Favour and Indulgence, which the Inequality of the Combat procured for my former Book against you. In this, what Reason I may have to expect it, I cannot tell; but I fear I have but too much Reason to desire it. The Subject of the Greatest Part of it is Dry and Unpleasant in its own Nature, so as scarce to admit of any Ornament, or any thing which might be thrown in to enliven a Dull Scene: It is also perfectly New and Unbeaten, and, if your word may be taken for it, entirely given up by some of the most Learned Men in the Nation; and yet in these Circumstances I have had the Hardiness, Alone, and without any the least Assistance, to engage with three *Learned and Judicious* Adversaries. But that which gives me the greatest Occasion to lay in my Petition for Excuse and Candour, is the Necessity I was under of sending almost two thirds of these Papers to the Press as fast as I could write them; so many were the New Observations which occurred to me upon the Review of the whole Case.

Upon

P O S T S C R I P T.

Upon these Accounts I flatter my self with the Hopes of some Allowances for any Mistakes or Marks of Hast, which may be Observed either in the Argument, or the Method, or the Style of this Letter; and the rather because this is Likely to be the Last Time that I shall *trouble* you or *the World* with any *Amusements* about the *Honesty* of *Athanasius*, or any thing else. But I would not have you misunderstand me; This Request I make to those only, who are to be the Judges betwixt us: From you I neither expect nor desire any Favour in this kind; but only that, if you shall think fit once more to return me a Repetition instead of a Reply, you would be so kind as to hold me Excused from any Farther Correspondence with you, which may not be carried on by the Post. And so, Sir, I humbly take my Leave of you and *the Publick*, in the Quality of an Author.

T H E E N D.

ERRATA.

P. 45. l. 16. r. He does not only *ſpeak as if there were one Divinity in all the three Perſons*, as you afterwards endeavour to bring your ſelf off; but expreſſly affirms that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are One God. P. 128. No. 6. d. Car. 1. P. 133. No. 29. inf, *Sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde* Car. 3.

BOOKS Printed for and Sold by CORNELIUS
CROWNFIELD at the UNIVERSITY-PRESS
in CAMBRIDGE.

Suidæ Lexicon, Græce & Latine. Textum Græcum cum Manuscriptis Codicibus collatum a quamplurimis mendis purgavit, Notisque perpetuis illustravit: Versionem Latinam Æmili Porti innumeris in locis correxit; Indicesque Auctorum & Rerum adjecit *Ludolphus Kusterus*, Professor humaniorum literarum in Gymnasio Regio Berolinensi. *Folio, 1710.*

Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex Recensione & cum Notis atque Emendationibus *Richardi Bentleii*, Quarto, 1711.

Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica. Auctore *Isaaco Newtono*, Equite Aurato. Editio Secunda Auctior & Emendatior. *Quarto, 1713.*

C. Crispi Sallustii quæ extant; cum Notis Integris Glareani, Rivii, Ciacconii, Gruteri, Carrionis, Manutii, Putschii, Doussæ; Selectis Castilionei, C. & A. Popmæ, Palmerii, Ursini, J. Fr. Gronovii, Victorii, &c. Accedunt Julius Exsuperantius, Porcius Latro; & Fragmenta Historicorum Vett. cum Notis A. Popmæ. Recensuit, Notas perpetuas, & Indices adjecit *Josephus Wasse*, Coll. Regin. apud Cantab. Socius; & Nobiliss. Marchioni de Kent a Sacris Domesticis. Praemittitur Sallustii Vita, Auctore, V. Cl. *Joanne Clerico*. Quarto, 1710.

C. Julii Cæsaris quæ extant Omnia. Ex Recensione *Joannis Davissii*, Coll. Regin. Cantab. Socii, cum ejusdem Animadversionibus ac Notis Pet. Ciacconii, Fr. Hotomanni, Joan. Brantii, Dionys. Vossii & aliorum. Accessere Metaphrasis Græca Librorum VII. De Bello Gallico, nec non Indices necessarii. *Quarto, 1706.*

Remarks

Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-Thinking: In a Letter to F. H. D. D. by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis. Part the First, the Third Edition; and Part the Second, the Second Edition, Octavo, 1714.

V. Cl. Andreae Tacquet Soc. Jesu Sacerdotis & Matheseos Professoris Elementa Geometriæ Planæ ac Solidæ; & Selecta ex Archimede Theoremata. Accedunt Corollaria non pauca illustrandis Elementis accomodata, & varios propositionum plurimarum Usus continentia. Summa cura emendata, & XL Schematibus novis æri incisis illustrata. A *Gulielmo Whiston*, A. M. Matheseos Professore Lucasiano apud Cantabrigienses. Editio Secunda, aliquanto auctior, & emendatior. *Octavo, 1710.*

Bernhardi Varenii Geographia Generalis, in qua affectiones generales Telluris explicantur. Adjecta est Appendix, præcipua Recentiorum inventa ad Geographiam spectantia continens, A *Jacobo Furin*, A. M. Collegii S. Trinitatis Socio, & Scholæ Publicæ Novocastrensis Archididascalo. *Octavo, 1712.*

Emendationes in Menandri & Philemonis Reliquias, ex nupera Editione *Joannis Clerici*: Ubi multa Grotii & aliorum, plurima vero Clerici errata castigantur. Auctore *Phileleuthero Lipsiensi*. Scriptæ Anno MDCCX. Accedit Epistola Critica *Richardi Bentleyi* de Joanne Malela Antiocheno; Scripta Anno MDCXCI. Editio Altera Emendatior. *Octavo, 1713.*

Q. Horatius Flaccus ad nuperam *Richardi Bentleyi* Editionem accurate expressus. Notas addidit *Thomas Bentleyus*, A. B. Collegii S. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigienses Alumnus. *Octavo, 1713.*

M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, ex iterata Recensione *Joannis Davisi*, LL. D. Coll. Regin. Cantab. Socii; cum ejusdem Animadversionibus, ac Notis Integris Des. Heraldi & Nic. Rigaltii, nec non Selectis

lectis aliorum. Accedit Commodianus, Ævi Cyprianici Scriptor, cum Observationibus antehac Editis, aliisque nonnullis, quæ jam primum prodeunt. *Octavo*, 1712.

Θεοφράστῃ Χαρακτῆρες Ἠθικοί. Theophrasti Characteres Ethici. Græce & Latine. Cum Notis ac Emendationibus Isaaci Casauboni & Aliorum. Accedunt Jacobi Duporti Prælectiones jam primum Editæ. Græca cum vetustissimis MSS. collata recensuit, & Notas adjecit, *Pet. Needham*, S. T. B. Coll. Div. Johan. Cantab. Socius. *Octavo*, 1713.

Hieroclis Philosophi Alexandri Commentarius in Aurea Carmina, de Providentia & Fato quæ supersunt, & reliqua Fragmenta. Græce & Latine. Græca cum MSS. collata castigavit, Versionem recensuit, Notas & Indicem adjecit *Pet. Needham*, S. T. B. Coll. D. Joannis Cantab. Socius. *Octavo*, 1713.

Balthasaris Castilionis Comitis Libri IV. De Curiali sive Aulico ex Italico Sermone in Latinum conversi Interprete *Bartholomæo Clarke*. Recensuit *Samuel Drake*, A. M. Coll. Div. Joh. Cantab. Socius. *Octavo*, 1713.

Lexicon Novi Testamenti Alphabeticum, nunc primum plenè editum: Continens omnes Voces tam Primitivas quàm Derivativas, Anomalas atque Communes, in sacro Textu occurrentes; cum earum Resolutione Grammaticâ. In Usus Scholarium. Studio & Labore *Joan. Dawson*, A. B. *Octavo*, 1706.

Publii Virgilii Maronis Bucolica, Georgica, & Æneis. Ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem recensita. Editio Altera. 12°. 1711.

Publii Terentii Afri Comœdiæ ad optimorum Exemplarium fidem recensitæ. Accesserunt Variæ Lectiones, quæ in Libris MSS. & Eruditorum Commentariis notatu digniores occurrunt. Editio Altera. 12°. 1701.









